THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

A QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF THE CHRISTIAN THOUGHT AND LIFE SET FORTH FROM THE SCRIPTURES BY EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

VOL. XXX, No. 4 OCTOBER, 1923

A Study in Church Worship HORACE B. BLACKMER 385

The Second Coming of the Lord: Scripture and Event. III. WILLIAM F. WUNSCH 398

The Affectional Appeal in Missionary Work EDMOND CONGAR BROWN 412

The Old Testament Mission of the Jews EDNAH C. SILVER. 427

Started for Christian Citizenship CHARLES W. HARVEY 448

"The Mind in the Making" [a review of the book by James Harvey Robinson] LEWIS F. HITE 459

(For Editorial Department, see next page.)

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

Editorials :

THE REVIEW, and Some Notes on the Prospect
WM. F. WUNSCH - - - - - - - - - - 467
Creeds, Doctrines, Religion, and Life LEWIS F. HITE - - 477

Biblical and Doctrinal Studies :

Idle Words EVERETT KING BRAY - - - - - - - 486
How the Word Came WM. F. WUNSCH - - - - - 491

Current Literature :

Paul Heuzé's "Do the Dead Live?" B. A. WHITTEMORE - - 499
Charles Richet's "Thirty Years of Psychical Research"
B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - - 502
J. J. Donnelly's "Subjective Concepts of Humans"
B. A. WHITTEMORE - - - - - - - - - 505
Dom C. Butler's "Western Mysticism" E. A. WARREN, JR. - 508
T. M. Martin's "Immortality Certain" H. D. DOWNWARD - 511

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW first appeared in January, 1894, succeeding the monthly *New Jerusalem Magazine* (established in 1827). The quarterly form is adapted to more elaborate articles and fuller discussion of current literature and current events. The REVIEW aims to serve as an international organ of the best thought, progressive and constructive as well as retrospective and critical, of the New Church.

The Board of Editors consists of the Rev. Lewis F. Hite as managing editor, the Rev. William F. Wunsch (in charge of "Studies") and Mr. B. A. Whittemore (in charge of "Current Literature"); with the Rev. Messrs. H. Clinton Hay and Mr. Kenneth P. Kempton in an advisory capacity.

Published by THE MASS. NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 BOWDOIN STREET, BOSTON

50 CENTS A COPY ALBERT P. CARTER, Treas. $2.00 A YEAR

(Postage to Canada 12 Cents, and to Europe 20 Cents Extra, Per Annum.)

Entered at the Post-Office at Boston as Second Class Matter (Printed in U.S.A.)

THE

NEW-CHURCH REVIEW

VOL. XXX.] OCTOBER, 1923 [No. 4

A STUDY IN CHURCH WORSHIP.*

BY HORACE B. BLACKMER.

WORSHIP among the early Christians was congregational. The early followers of the risen and ascended Lord met as a body of worshipers, and participated actively in a united service which was a personal expression of glorification to God and of loyalty to the Savior. Founded upon the synagogal service in existence at the time, the Christian service made a step in advance beyond the Jewish practices by adding as a culminating act the eucharistic service. The people took part in the services in prayers (I Tim. ii, 1-3, 8; Acts ii, 42), in responses (I Cor. xiv, 16), and especially in "psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing . . . to the Lord" (Col. iii, 16; Eph. v, 19).

[With the advent] of the hierarchical organization which became matured and consolidated under the Western popes and the Eastern patriarchs, an elaborate system of rites and ceremonies arose, which at last became formulated into unvarying types of devotional expression. Music participated in this ritualistic movement; it rapidly became liturgical and clerical, the laity

* This paper gives the substance of an address before the Boston Society of the New Jerusalem last Spring.

ceased to share in the worship of song and resigned this office to a chorus drawn from the minor clergy, and a highly organized body of chants, applied to every moment of the service, became almost the entire substance of worship music, and remained so for a thousand years. (Edward Dickinson, Music in the History of the Western Church, p. 36f.)

By the middle of the fourth century, if not earlier, this change was complete. The offices of public devotion, including that of song, were concentrated exclusively in the hands of the clergy. The people became mere spectators of a semi-dramatic action; their presence at the service was solicited but not necessary to its conduct.

The Reformation restored to the people active participation in worship, and especially vested in the laity the office of congregational song. One of Luther's explicit contentions was, that worship is not a spectacle or a vicarious operation, like the Mass, but a personal act on the part of the people individually and collectively. As a means of providing an opportunity for congregational activity, he advocated and developed the hymn with such zeal and success that his enemies soon said that he made more converts by his hymns than by all his preaching.

The Reformation in England, however, brought about no such restoration of worship to the congregation. The break from the papal authority being in that country chiefly a matter of politics, it affected the common people but slightly. The Church of England considered itself the legitimate heir to what was noblest and purest in Catholicism; its liturgy was largely drawn from the office-books of the ancient Church; its congregations remained bodies of observers and not of active participants. Only the Puritans under Calvin's leadership threw aside everything formal and artistic in worship as an offence to God, and encouraged the singing by the congregation of metrical translations of the psalms as the only musical observance permitted in the sanctuary.[1]

[1] A visitor to Geneva in 1557 wrote as follows: "A most interesting sight is offered in the city on the week days, when the hour

The Catholic system of worship today differs but little from its form in the time of its crystallization; in regard to the attitude of the people attending a service, it differs not at all. So, too, with the Church of England, and her daughter or sister churches in Ireland, Scotland, the United States of America, and the British colonies; in the "high church" or "choral" service, little participation is allotted to the people; in the "low church" or "parochial" service, more freedom is allowed by the introduction of hymns, responsive reading of the Psalter, responsive prayers, and joint recitation of prayers and creed. To Luther and Calvin, the people of the Protestant churches of today owe their freedom of worshiping directly for themselves, and particularly of singing to the Lord without intermediary or substitute.

The office of song in the Mediæval Church was relegated to a choir composed of clerical assistants. Since that time, the idea of a choir as an adjunct of divine worship has never been displaced, except temporarily. The rapid development of music had already brought about by the time of the Reformation a style of singing full of spiritual possibilities, but of a difficulty which no congregation could handle. This music Luther was loath to forego. With all his advocacy of congregational song, he clung tenaciously to the choir as a valuable agency of worship. The English Church, too, so thoroughly agreed on this point that, before the sixteenth century was over, it had already fully established a style of choir music that at many points still challenges admiration. During the last three centuries neither the Lutheran nor the Anglican liturgical system has

---

for the sermon approaches. As soon as the first sound of the bell is heard all shops are closed, all conversation ceases, all business is broken off, and from all sides the people hasten into the nearest meeting-house. There each one draws from his pocket a small book which contains the psalms with notes, and out of full hearts, in the native speech, the congregation sings before and after the sermon. Everyone testifies to me how great consolation and edification is derived from this custom."

been greatly changed. Consequently, every point in their musical practices is supported by settled and pervasive traditions, the fruits of much disciplined thought and experience.

In America the case is far different. We are in the midst of a remarkable liturgical evolution. In no one denomination is there complete unanimity among the societies of its membership regarding the form of service, and particularly regarding the use of music in the worship of the Church. The Catholic and Episcopal Churches are more uniform in this respect than their non-liturgic brethren.

> An authoritative ritual carries its laws over upon music also; tradition, thus fortified, holds firm against innovation, and the liturgic and clerical conception of music gives a stability to musical usages which no aberrations of taste can quite unsettle. But in the non-liturgic churches of America one sees only a confusion of purpose, a lack of agreement, an absence of every shade of recognized authority. The only tradition is that of complete freedom of choice. There is no admitted standard of taste; the whole musical service is experimental, subject to the preferences, more or less capricious, of choir-master or music-committee. There is no system in the separate societies that may not be overthrown by a change of administration. (Dickinson, *ibid.*, p. 392.)

The New Church in America has shown, in the midst of all this unrest on the part of the Protestant Churches, a consistent trend towards liturgic unity. It lacks but six years of a century ago when the first Boston Liturgy[1] established for New England a form of service distinct from that already in existence in Baltimore and elsewhere.[2] Independent liturgies, at a later date, were forth-

[1] The Book of Publick Worship, prepared for the use of the Boston Society of the New Jerusalem, with Selections from the Sacred Scriptures, adapted to Chants. Boston. 1829.

[2] The Liturgy of the New Church, together with Hymns,—Baltimore, 1792; The Liturgy of the New Jerusalem Church,—Philadelphia, 1816; The Liturgy of the New Jerusalem Church, together with Hymns,—Philadelphia, 1822.

coming from New York, Ohio, and Illinois. The organization and development of the General Convention has had its unifying effect upon our liturgical practices. The issuing in 1912 of a single Book of Worship for the whole Church was an event of which we but dimly as yet realize the full significance. We have still, in common with the other Churches, certain problems in regard to our worship which we have not yet worked out. Not the least of these questions is some clearer understanding of the use of music in our services, and particularly of the peculiar function of the choir and its relation to the congregation. It would seem that we of the New Church should have a source of assistance in our doctrines which the Protestant Churches lack, and which the traditions of the Catholic and the Anglican Churches to some extent supply.

We meet in church to worship God. There are two essentials: (1) the object of worship, God, present with us in our Church through the opened Word in the lighted repository; and (2) the body of worshipers, the congregation. The minister is the servant of both. To show that he does not act of himself, that he has laid aside everything of self, he dons his robe. He serves God by becoming His mouthpiece, speaking to us from the pages of the Holy Word. He serves us by addressing to God the prayers which we fain would utter ourselves; he serves us, too, as our leader in the prayers and responses that we all know and repeat in unison. In the communion service he serves God by representing Him in the breaking of bread and the pouring of wine; but at the last moment he becomes one of us again as he himself partakes of the sacraments while turning toward the Word.

Where does our choir fit in all this? Does it serve in dual capacity similar to the minister? Should we place it within the chancel, beside the minister? No! we should not consider it as partaking in any degree of the priestly office. There is only one possibility: the choir must be viewed as a part of the congregation itself. It is a part of us! It worships with us!

The first purpose of the choir is to support and foster congregational singing, that it may furnish a vocal nucleus to which the voices of the people can attach themselves, a positive mass of harmony in which every singer in the congregation can find his place with confidence and comfort. A choir acting in this capacity—as congregational leader and guide—is simply a specialized segment of the congregation itself. It is a part slightly separated in thought and action with direct reference to the fuller activity of the whole. (Waldo Selden Pratt, Musical Ministries in the Church, p. 90f.)

What, then, should be the relative positions of the congregation proper, and the musically gifted "segment" we call the choir? Should the singers, in other words, be placed in front of, or behind, the main body of worshipers? Another question will show us the answer most clearly. Could any one of us seriously think of worshiping while turning away from the Word? It is impossible! Yet, if we place our singers at the front and expect them to turn toward us as they offer their own particular anthem of worship, or as they assist us in our own expressions of worship, we will continually be witnessing the anomaly of a group of worshipers pouring out their hearts in worship while turning aside from the object of worship. Even when we place our choir outside the chancel at the front sides (as the architectural exigencies of many churches demand at the present day), the proper normal attitude of the singers as worshipers should be toward the chancel and not toward us. The only alternative left, then, is that our specialized group of the congregation should be behind us in order to give us the fullest assistance and support, and in order that they themselves may enter into the worship with the utmost fullness.

Even the Church of England is beginning to realize the assistance that its congregations might receive from its choirs, if the singers were at the rear. One of the foremost professors of ecclesiastical art in the English Church remarks:

We have not yet come into our inheritance by taking the whole

congregation into our fellowship: the priest still "takes the service," and preaches, while the congregation look on, and sometimes faintly join in the singing. We have not regained the *thrill* of public worship. The congregation ought to sing the service, the choir merely helping them (which they can often most satisfactorily do *from the west end*).[1]

The "west end" to the Anglican (as indeed it should be for us, because of the correspondence) is behind the worshipers.

Most of us, I think, in considering the choir at the front of the congregation (as we find it in a great number of churches at the present day) concentrate our thought on the times when the choir sings by itself in its more or less elaborate anthems. In a service such as ours, an hour and a half in length, the choir sings by itself not often more than fifteen minutes,—usually less. If it is our contention that at these times we ought to be able to see the singers, we are laboring under a misapprehension born of the theatre and the concert stage, or of Catholicism. We would actually, during the anthem, transfer our attention from the object of our worship to the choir, and at the end of the anthem transfer our attention back. In other words, the anthem would be practically an interruption of our worship. With the choir in front, this "interruption" is inevitable in the case of ninety-nine persons out of a hundred.

All anthems expressive of direct worship need to be treated as essentially congregational in origin and character. They are not addressed to the people, but offered on their behalf. To achieve this as a positive fact is very difficult, since it involves an eminent degree of self-control on the part of all parties engaged, both choir and congregation. The singers must sing as distinctly conscious that they are only substitutes for the real agents, and the congregation must appropriate the singing as if it were its own. Nothing can bring this about in most cases except long-continued processes of ministerial guidance, reinforced by the cordial cooperation of the organist and the choir. There are radical dif-

[1] Percy Dearmer, M.A., D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical Art, King's College, London, in The Art of Public Worship, p. 100.

ferences between church music and concert music, which all thoughtful persons know both by instinct and by reflection, but in too many churches these differences have been so much obliterated that a simply concertistic style of music has completely driven out the true church style. This result, wherever it is found, is an unmixed evil, for which usually the blame is to be distributed among the minister and the musicians and the people.

Doubtless one of the occasions of the trouble has often been the heedless use of the quartette form of choir, which is a peculiarly American institution. Such choirs, to be artistically good, must usually be made up mostly of those who are professional or semi-professional concert-singers. It is naturally hard for them to leave their customary frame of mind behind them when they enter the church door, and equally hard for the people to regard them as they sing during the service in any but the ordinary light of the parlor or the concert-hall. But the case is not hopeless, as some quartettes have finely demonstrated on their part, and as many a congregation is ready to show on its part under the stimulus of a little tactful suggestion and help. The difficulty, however, is not confined to any one form of choir, but belongs to all vicarious exercises in public worship that rise to any considerable pitch of artistic intensity. Only by means of a diffused thoughtfulness and a constant desire and determination on the part of all who engage in such exercises can they be prevented from becoming spectacular and sensational instead of truly devotional. (Pratt, *ibid.*, p. 98f.)

The true object of our order of service is a consistent, progressive act of worship from the beginning of the organ prelude to the benediction. At certain points in the service, song breaks from our lips spontaneously. We arise from the Lord's Prayer with our hearts and lips singing the Sanctus. The service progresses until, after the Second Lesson, our hearts burn within us as we leap to our feet with "Glory be to the Lord, our Heavenly King"! This culminates this part of the worship. Then comes instruction in how to live a better life for the coming week, that we may the more worthily worship the Lord the next Sunday; and after the pastor has developed some particular theme ("Lead us not into temptation," for instance), our hearts are singing again to express some thought which his eloquence has awakened, and we wish, oh, how we wish!

we could adequately express ourselves. How those remarks have reminded us of the comforting words: "Seek ye the Lord while He may be found. Call ye upon Him while He is near. He will have mercy and abundantly pardon!" Are those singers singing *to* us? No, indeed! They are singing *for* us, *with* us—singing the very words that are in our hearts. Do we regret that we cannot *see* them sing? On the contrary, we do not wish to be reminded that it is not ourselves doing the singing. We are still pouring out our hearts and minds to God. We are still worshiping.

There is much in the Writings of the Church in agreement with the foregoing remarks. The New-Churchman hardly needs to be referred to the "Doctrine of the Lord" for confirmation of the statement that the object of our worship is God; nor to the Doctrine of the Sacred Scripture for confirmation that the Lord is present with us through the opened Word.

If we would pattern the arrangement of our places of worship according to the heavenly plan, we have a very definite description of meetings in places of worship in heaven:

> The preacher stands in a pulpit at the east. Those who are in the light of wisdom more than others sit in front of him; those who are in less light sit to the right and left of these. There is a circular arrangement of the seats, so that all are in the preacher's view, no one so sitting at either side as to be out of his view. . . . No one is permitted to stand behind the pulpit; when there is any one there the preacher is confused. (Heaven and Hell, n. 223; cf. Conjugial Love, n. 23.)

To how many of us it has come as a decided shock to find, upon entering a Protestant Church, a choir, varying in size from a single soloist to fifty or sixty singers as the case may be, placed behind and visibly raised above the level of the Word and the minister! The choir arranged behind the minister is not wholly unknown even in the New Church, unfortunately, although its being elevated in this position has been consistently frowned upon. Some-

times, also, it is placed beside the minister, somewhat in the position where, in the heavenly manner of doing (according to the paragraph just cited), "those stand who are being initiated."

That the minister serves in dual capacity is quite self-evident. The idea of the pastor as the shepherd of his flock is universal in the Christian churches. Our ordination service makes it clear that the candidate is to become a specially authorized representative of the Lord, to serve "as a priest of the Lord's New Church." As to the representative character of the priest, we have this instruction:

> All priests, whoever and of whatever quality they are, by their priestly office itself represent the Lord. The priestly office itself is holy, whatever be the quality of him who ministers therein; from this it is that the Word taught by a wicked man is equally holy, and also the sacrament of baptism and the Holy Supper, and the like. Hence also it may be evident that no priest can in any sort claim to himself anything of the holy pertaining to his priesthood. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3670[2].)

The minister often is the Lord's mouthpiece, as we all must realize, for we read:

> The Word can not be taught otherwise than mediately by parents, teachers, books, and especially the reading of it. Yet it is not taught by them, but by the Lord through them. This is also known by preachers, who say that they do not speak from themselves but from the Spirit of God. (Divine Providence, n. 172.)

The general reference to the "Doctrine of the Lord," made above in speaking of the object of worship, might be supplemented by such concise statements as that from the "Apocalypse Revealed," n. 630, "The Lord alone is to be worshiped. To acknowledge as holy is signified by worshiping." What, then, is worship?

> Worship itself is nothing but a certain activity existing from the celestial which is within. The celestial itself can in no wise be without activity. Worship is its first activity. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1561.)

No passivity here, while we watch some one perform acts of worship for us!

> When man is in genuine worship, then the Lord flows into the goods and truths which are with him, and elevates them to Himself, and with them the man, so far and in such manner as he is in them. (*Ibid.*, n. 10,299.)

Man must not, however, be passive. He must still think, will, and act as of himself, and yet ascribe all to the Lord. In other words, he must perforce from his very nature return praise to God. He returns praise to God in the offerings he makes to the Lord in his acts of worship (cf. Arcana Cœlestia, nn. 9938, 9459-61). It is the whole act of worship that is meant when the minister prefaces the offertory with the exhortation: "Give unto the Lord, all ye kindreds of the people . . . . bring an offering, and come into his courts."

There are several pages in the "Arcana Cœlestia" devoted to singing (nn. 8261-67), pointing out that

> Songs signify glorification of the Lord, that is, celebration of Him from gladness of heart; for gladness of heart is especially expressed by song, since in song gladness as it were of itself breaks forth into sound. . . . There is glorification of the Lord in the heavens by choirs, and thus by the concordant singing of many (n. 8261). . . . The Lord desires glorification from man (n. 8263).

It is to be noted in connection with this reference that choirs in the heavens are societies of angels making simultaneous expression of the affection of some love. There is no thought of auditors. The spontaneous expression is directed to the Lord alone, as the center of all life. And the following passage should be of interest to all concerned in proper expression of worship:

> Glorifications and celebrations of the Lord are proclaimed out of the Word, because they are done from the Lord; for He is the Word, that is, the very Divine Truth therein. (Conjugial Love, n. 81.)

It would seem, then, that the early Christian worship,

which as we have said was founded upon the synagogal service (which in turn was derived from the Temple worship), most closely resembled worship in the heavens. The people gathered for worship, as the angels must gather for worship, with the joy of their Lord in their hearts and upon their lips. Gladness of heart found expression in glorification and celebrations of the Lord. Like the angels, those people met with a singleness of purpose and a spontaneity of utterance that we can but feebly emulate today. In our personal expressions of worship, as with many other things, we are hampered seriously by the limitations of our natural bodies. No prayer so eloquent, no song so sweet and fervent, but that we wish we were personally its originator. Few of us are gifted with superior eloquence. Many of us are unable to adequately express ourselves in song. We must needs fall back upon the trained speaker and singer to supply us with the most exalted portions of our united worship.

As we have seen, the early Christians soon felt the need of trained singers, and established the choir. They erred, however, in depriving the people of all participation in worship. "Worship is activity." The Reformation, recognizing this fact, insisted upon the activity of the people. The choir was retained as an aid to the congregation in its ordinary forms of expression, and as a vicarious agent in its more exalted expressions. This is the function of the choir today.

Unless the congregation is active in some way in every part of the service, worship ceases. In no place in the Writings have we reason to suppose that we are expected in the course of worship to delegate to someone else our powers of worship while we ourselves sit back passively entertained, with attention diverted from the true object of worship. All our worship should be directed from man to the Lord. Every act of our public worship should make this clear and plain. The congregation (including the singers) should face the Word (as the Lord) and the minister (as the Lord's representative). The Lord's Word

goes forth by the instrumentality of the voice of His representative; the response comes back from "the ends of the earth,"—center answers to center.

We have no place in a New-Church service for inactivity. If *Nunc licet* means anything to us, it should mean activity,—active participation in every detail of worship allotted to us as a congregation, active listening as the Word is read, active thought as instruction is given. We must come to our worship with gladness of heart. Gladness of heart finds expression in songs of glorification. The Lord desires glorification from man. Glorifications of the Lord are proclaimed out of the Word.

Give unto the Lord, O ye kindreds of the people, give unto the Lord glory and strength. Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name: bring an offering and come into his courts. O worship the Lord in the beauty of holiness, fear before him, all the earth. (Psalm xcvi, 7-9.)

HORACE B. BLACKMER.

THE SECOND COMING OF THE LORD: SCRIPTURE AND EVENT.

By the Rev. William F. Wunsch.

III. The Coming with Clouds.

WE have kept for examination by itself the passage in *Mark* xiii which promises the most definite information on how the Lord comes the second time. It is the verse reading, "And then shall they see the Son of man coming in the clouds with great power and glory" (26). We went into its meaning a little. We reminded ourselves that whenever God was to come, the Jews thought of His coming with clouds. It was a part of their picture of any appearance of God, or theophany. If, then, the picture was reproduced in the New Testament, and there the Son of man was to come with clouds, it would mean that the coming would be a revelation of God and an actual visitation of the earth by Him. The reality, or the objectivity of the event it is, which is impressed on the reader by that imagery. To any further and probably more specific meaning we meant to give a separate consideration.

The passage very well deserves to be considered by itself. It speaks out on that major point, the manner of the Lord's advent. If we need not to be misguided in any anticipation of His Coming, it is on this score, of the manner of it. The manner of the advent is of far more concern than the time. The time matters relatively little, if we are but anticipating something like the true manner of the Coming, or are open-minded to it. But mistaken and set ideas of how it will occur, and of what essentially it is, can blind us to the actual happening, at whatever

time it takes place. The Jews externalized the promises of a Messiah and of a reign of His, and looked for a political, or at least an earthly, kingdom. In the Lord's "kingdom which was not of this world" they saw only blasphemous pretense and unreality. Their understanding of the nature of the Messianic mission blinded them to the great "day" when it dawned. In one mode of analysis, what crucified the Lord was the too literal apprehension of the Messianic promises. There was an ironic glance at this in the superscription put over the cross, embodying as it did the political apprehension of the Messiah—"King of the Jews."

> If there is literal fulfilment of prophecy, the people were right, and Jesus was wrong; but if prophecy is as regards its form necessarily conditioned by the time and place of its utterance, but as regards its moral and spiritual substance essentially realized in that which apparently contradicts, because it really transcends, its form, Jesus by His ideal fulfilled, the people in their expectations obscured and distorted, the predictions of the prophets. (A. E. Garvie.)

Today unnumbered Christians are expecting the Lord to come actually in the clouds. The event could not, in this and other respects, be externalized more than they externalize it. But suppose it is not really to be of this outward sort. Holding firmly to their idea, will such believers not pass the less observable, but actual, happening by? Were the Coming a spiritual development, could it not even be in progress, without advertising itself in the least to them? Could not any of us then, for lack of penetrating the form of the predictions to their "moral and spiritual substance," miss the actual fulfilment? If anywhere we need to watch our interpretation and conclusion, it is to make no mistaken sense of this seemingly very explicit passage from the Lord's promises.

A further reason soon develops for taking the passage with the utmost care. As we ponder it, or inform ourselves in its history, it proves not nearly so definite a statement as at first it seems to be. Verbally precise enough, still it is a cryptic saying. It has the reticence of Scripture

prediction. Biblical forecasts of the future never plot the future so as to "give it away." We noted how the Lord was able to tell His disciples on what conditions His Coming would ensue, but not the day and hour when the conditions would be realized. The question arises whether the manner of His Coming was fully in His ken, any more than the time. He knew how He would come essentially, in the necessary realities of any approach to men, as in the gift of more light, and in the offer of life more abundantly; it would be objectively, too; but need the externalities by which the objectivity would be achieved have been in His view in the least? Neither a manger nor a throne was assigned the Lord for His appearance by the predictions of His First Coming. Room was left for event to import detail into the essential significance of the promises. And now the very language in His prediction of how He would come the second time, has the sound of a deliberate reticence along with the look of explicitness.

But if this is the consistent character of Scripture forecasts, the literal understanding of our passage rules itself out. It leaves nothing to the event. It is too inevitably precise. There is no need to study how the Lord will come, if there is not the reticence here which is true of Scripture forecasts generally, and if the words are to be taken in their easiest and superficial sense: He would come in a physical re-appearance necessarily, and in the clouds of the sky. Has it been realized how this interpretation drains the whole discourse in *Mark* xiii of force and sense? All the solemn summons to readiness of moral and spiritual perception has been unnecessary; that manner of advent, inevitably advertising Him, does not call on the moral perceptions to know Him. The warning against impostors who would hold themselves out to be the Christ, becomes meaningless. Who is likely to achieve any imposture if the Coming in the clouds means an appearance of the Christ in the skies? The Lord had said that His kingdom does not come with observation; but coming in the clouds of the sky He would be moving to

a highly spectacular inauguration of His kingdom. It would be impossible, too, He said, for men to cry of the Christ when He appeared, "Lo, here!" and "Lo, there!"; it would not be a localized happening; but would not that be in so many words the cry of the ecstatic crowds if He came in the clouds? Nor would His Coming then be like the lightning, shining from east to west, a pervasive advent.

We have further reason still for not taking our passage literally, if we are to give any heed at all to the history of such language as we have in it. Looking back over the Scriptures' use of it, we have imagery here, not language meant to be taken at its face value. To quote from a Commentary:

> The words take us back to Daniel's vision of the Coming "with the clouds of heaven, of One like unto the Son of man" (vii, 13). Daniel's vision referred to the advent of the kingdom of God, the imperishable kingdom of the saints, the kingdom of the regenerate Israel that was to take the place of the cruel, godless world-empires. The clouds are part of the imagery which expresses the heavenly order of this new kingdom. Elsewhere in the Old Testament the clouds are often used as figures of the descent of God, and His intervention on behalf of His people (*cf. Isa.* xix, 1, *Ps.* xviii, 11, 12, xcvii, 2). The imagery is to be similarly understood here.

We have only to glance over some of these older Scriptures in which the language is used, to appreciate that it is meant not literally but as imagery:

> Behold, the Lord rideth upon a swift cloud, and shall come into Egypt; and the idols of Egypt shall be moved at His presence, and the heart of Egypt shall melt in the midst of it. (*Isa.* xix, 1.)
>
> He made darkness His secret place; His pavilion round about Him were dark waters and thick clouds of the skies;
>
> At the brightness that was before Him His thick clouds passed, hail stones and coals of fire. (*Psalm* xviii, 11, 12.)
>
> Clouds and darkness are round about Him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation of His throne. (*Ps.* xcvii, 2.)
>
> Sing unto God, sing praises to His name, extol Him that rideth upon the clouds, by His name Jah, and rejoice before Him. (*Ps.* lxviii, 4.)

There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun who rideth in the heavens, and in His magnificence upon the clouds. (*Deut.* xxxiii, 26.)

Jehovah maketh the clouds His chariot. (*Ps.* civ, 3.)

If this seemingly most definite description of the manner of the Lord's Return cannot be understood literally without becoming untrue to the nature of Scripture forecasts and without running counter to what is said at other points in the discourse about the Coming, and if the language has been poetical and imaginative customarily, what meaning has it? We have taken it to mean in all earnestness an actual appearance of the Lord, and an actual visitation of the earth by Him; we are not taking from its force by an iota; but if the language is not literally intended, but is imagery, what further meaning has it?

There is another prediction in the New Testament which closely resembles ours about the Second Coming. It is not a prediction of that Coming. It looks to earlier fulfilment. It may be that if we can find event or development satisfying that prediction, we shall have something to help us with the meaning of our passage. The prediction we mean is the one which the Lord made to the high-priest at His ecclesiastical trial. The high-priest had pressed the Christ for an answer to the question whether He was the Son of God. At first remaining silent, the Lord had replied on the repetition of the question:

Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven. (*Matthew* xxvi, 64.)

The second half of this prediction differs from ours in "the little Apocalypse" only in that the latter adds the words "with great power and glory" after "in the clouds." If, then, we can get any clue from events to the force of the words "in the clouds" in this declaration to Caiaphas, we shall have made so much progress with their meaning in the present connection. Whatever occurred to answer to those words in Caiaphas's day, can be permitted at least to offer suggestion on their meaning for us.

What followed soon enough to answer to the prediction made to the high-priest? Even at the crucifixion the Lord began to exercise unwonted "power from on high." His last words and His expiration on the cross so affected a Roman guard that he exclaimed, "Truly this man was the Son of God." Caiaphas was receiving his answer. And already the kingdom was starting over from the Jews, who crucified its Initiator, to the Gentiles, who hailed Him. High-priest and all others who thought the Christ had been disposed of, could have some faint sense, as they watched the Christian movement struggle out into the world, that He who had created it, was fostering it from on high. "Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power." When else did the Son of man come, to satisfy the prediction to Caiaphas, except in this slow triumph of Christianity? And yet what was there in that progress which answered to His coming "in the clouds of heaven"? Did any aspects of the spread of Christianity recall those words? Recover in some of its broadest features that day of Christian beginnings, and there seems to be much, in the ways in which the Lord came home to the hearts and convictions of men, to remind us of those words, too. His Gospel and His life, they felt, opened heaven to them; but not without trial, not without the hard loss of friend and relative, not without some persecution, not without much to cloud their joy and their very convictions. What seemed like the one cause which should fairly dazzle the world, struggled along, too, in the obscurity of any Oriental sect in the great Empire. There was enough to hide the new light from any but the most independent soul, and to obscure the cause from any but the most loyal. Nevertheless the Lord made His coming to increasing numbers. We need to bring into the picture just how He did. In Palestine He had recruited His followers in physical presence with them. But they were rapidly to become now the smallest conceivable nucleus as Christian gains proceeded. To most of His followers the Lord came the first time as the Christian tradition was carried abroad by

the Apostles orally or by letter, and later as that tradition was set down and circulated in the Gospels. We could hardly leave out of the picture of how the Lord came in fulfilment of the prediction to the high-priest the part which the Gospels, preached and written, had in making Him known. By them His coming was extended to the world. In the face of difficulties and trials then for His followers, and despite the obscurity on the little movement in the great empire, slowly, by force of the Gospel, preached and at length written, the Lord prevailed to make His coming to all the world. In what else are we to find fulfilment of the Lord's triumphant declaration to the high-priest? What more splendid fulfilment could there be, its splendor the greater for having pierced the oblivion and dark circumstance that it did?

> Hereafter ye shall see the Son of man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven.

Some of these features in the progress of early Christianity point naturally enough to the Lord's words that He would come in the clouds of heaven. The obscurity with which the little movement was enveloped in the world, does. The hardships do, and the personal tragedies, small and great, which clouded a heavenly happiness for so many. The dark judgment does, which must have fallen on the unseeing and resisting world. Doubtless other things went to answer to the Lord's prediction that He would come in the clouds of heaven. But how are we put in mind at all of that imagery by the fact that it was in the Gospels that the Lord came to the major part of Christendom? That was the fact. The oral tradition and then the Gospels bore Him over the limits of Palestine, and became the vehicle of His advent to the world at large. Yet where is there any just intimation "in the clouds of heaven" of the part which the Gospels had in disclosing Christ to the world? Or is the outstanding feature in His coming not to be found in the prediction of how He would come? In the prediction the happening is stripped of persons and

events. Apostles, and their work, even the Gospels as such, do not exist in the view of the prediction. And in fact the men, called Peter, or John, or Paul, or by whatever name, who bore the Gospel to the world, were significant because, in their measure they were "the light of the world." Such they were in the Lord's own view; so He spoke of them. The burden of what they had to say, also, was the Christ Himself, the very Light of the world. In preaching Him, however, the limitations of these men, their points of view, their inabilities, drew obscurities over the message and over the very person of Christ. They started out in obscurity themselves on this and that aspect of their Gospel. How should they not, who had so often been slow to believe, and so poor in understanding? How should they not, when they had felt not infrequently that the Master had spoken to them, not plainly, but in proverbs? And if the light had to shine in some obscurity as they were the vehicles of it, it was caught and passed on so in the Gospels themselves, necessarily, when these came to be written down. Can it be doubted in view of the questions which all too soon broke out, and the controversies, even over the Person of the Lord—which above all the Gospels were designed to set forth? Today contrary views of the Master, Son of God in a unique sense, and son of God as it is open to any man to be a son of God, are drawn from these Scriptures. The Lord Himself had reserved plain words about the profound relation He bore to the Father to a future time; over that and other light He drew a veil. In the Gospels themselves the light of the kingdom of heaven still shone in darkness. As the Master looked forward, the perpetuation of His mission might well present itself to Him exactly as the Light of heaven overcoming the shadows and the hard places of the world and the black depths of evil and sin. "Ye shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven." So He came, as the Gospels prevailed to present Him, whatever the obscurities that trailed in the wake of their glory. Extending His Advent to men everywhere, necessarily they

reached, too, into the further darkness "of the world." It would be more than strange if the outstanding fact in how He did come were not to be found in the prediction of how He would come.

If we feel that we are far from the plain meaning of words when we place the very Gospels into our picture in the character of "the clouds of heaven," let us consider some other instances of a similar mode of speech. We are taking the words no differently from the way in which the Lord obviously used many of the words and phrases which fell from His lips. "The clouds of heaven" is a phrase that challenges us to think of other Scripture utterance with a like cryptic sound. The words have the manner of that indirect expression of thought about spiritual reality which was the nature of ancient religious insight. Our direct, or psychological, outlook on our inner life is very modern. In the early life of religious man spiritual reality was contemplated indirectly and was indirectly spoken of. Suggestions of it would be caught under some type, in the priest, or in the forms and habits of objects of nature. The first Psalm offers more than one example of this mode of utterance, glancing at the spiritual in terms taken squarely from the natural world. Such language, where the metaphor is at all buried from sight, and not pointed to by the context, is often baffling, at first. The Lord's mountains which faith could remove, is an instance of the use of such language by Him. So is His "leaven," when He meant the doctrine and influence of the Pharisees. So are His words quite often when He has to load them with His most intimate insight; for example, His "bread" and "wine," "flesh" and "blood" of the Supper. When He makes the prediction that He will come in the clouds of heaven, is He not resorting to such language, and using it to convey the meaning of a prevision which must deal in the suggestiveness and comprehensiveness of imagery?

What stronger enforcement of the meaning of a prediction is there, anyway, than is given it by the event? And what other development is there to cite in satisfaction of

the Lord's prediction to the high-priest than the slow and difficult but sure triumph of Christianity? As for even the declaration that He would come in the clouds of heaven, what answers with more truth to the Lord's own outlook on the fortunes of His mission, than the extension of His kingdom by the Scriptures, in which, in more ways than one, the light shone still in darkness? The form of the whole prediction is unexpectedly met, only to realize its substance the more truly. In the coming of the Son of man in the way Christianity spread, we have something infinitely better than might have been expected, certainly something more "in the world," more natural, more human, just as in the Lord's Gospel and kingdom at the outset men found what was infinitely more to the purpose than the Messianic reign of which they had dreamed. Here was no "wild" coming, with the rude force of the spectacular, as one could easily imagine a coming in the clouds to be. It was a sane, necessary advent the Lord made in satisfaction of the words to Caiaphas, one truer to realities, lodged in history, not interrupting it. His thoughts are not our thoughts, nor his ways ours. Men look for some unnatural appearance on the clouds of the sky. Slowly a Lord, so near to their experience and so compassionate to their poor apprehensions of Him that He seems not the Divine Being they look for, makes His way over men's hearts and minds, the light of His Gospel outshining doubts and hard places and the dark places which evil and sin keep up. "And possibly it might be intended that events as they come to pass should open and ascertain the meaning of several parts of Scripture" (Butler).

What shall we say now of our similar prediction of the Lord's Second Coming? How have we helped ourselves in the interpretation of it? The passage varies from the one which we have considered only in the addition of the words "with great power and glory." "And then shall ye see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with great power and glory." If the words point to anything like the development for which they stood in the pre-

diction to the high-priest, they mean in general that the Lord comes the second time, in the rise of Christianity to new meaning and force. He returns to give fresh growth and efficacy to the Christian life and faith, as He came the first time to inaugurate them. Must not this be the heart of His re-asserted Presence, or of any Parousia? Were the re-appearance to be physical it would be significant only as it had such an effect in men's spiritual life. On the other hand, this effect would itself be a far more powerful and pertinent Presence than any mere physical re-appearance. As for the words, in particular, that He would come in the clouds of heaven, which then were followed up by His coming to the world by way of Christian tradition and the Gospels, these words in our present prediction lead us to expect a close connection between His Second Coming and the Scriptures. It would seem that they are to have to do, even more forcefully and gloriously, with the renewal, as they had to do with the inauguration, of Christian life and thought. Is this not the conclusion to which the identical words in the two predictions would lead us? Latterly, too, it must be said, the Scriptures have been wrapped in an obscurity beyond what attended them at first. Their light has been overspread with the growth of theologies and creeds, which have certainly gone beyond the teaching of Scripture, and none too often answered to it. And if in the disintegration of these traditional theologies and the creeds the true force of Scripture was promised release, another obscurity has drifted over them, of a more practical and worse felt kind: the Scriptures have seemed to many remote from the problems and the spiritual needs of our day. Can they still serve to present the Christian life and thought as these must be presented to give the spiritual outlook and guidance which the world needs? The question is acute enough for some to imagine that a new Bible must be written. Others feel sure that the Scriptures can unfold in meaning and power for the day. They have found the capacity of the Scriptures to give up fresh and pertinent meaning exemplified, for instance, in

the Prophets and the Gospels, as they have sought there the application of Christian thought to contemporary moral and religious problems and needs.[1] They are assured by the Lord's own use of the Scriptures[2] that the Bible is capable of opening to meet the religious needs of men at any time. In the incident of the two disciples on their way to Emmaus there is an apt intimation of the power of the Scriptures to open into new meaning. As Cleopas and his fellow pedestrian trudge along, dejected in the belief that the Crucifixion had done away with their Lord and their hopes, He Himself joins them. As He goes the threescore furlongs with them, He traverses the length of the Old Testament Scriptures, and in what had become a tragically darkened record lights a meaning which gives them their Redeemer back in power and great glory. But that is no solitary example of this "opening" of the Scripture by Him. In all His teaching[3] He had been bringing a new range of truth into sight in the Scriptures. And still further disclosure of His mind than He was able to make then, He promised at a later day. "I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now." We can take in far greater earnest than we are disposed to do the conviction to which John Robinson gave a much-quoted utterance:

> I am convinced that the Lord hath more light and truth to break forth from His Holy Word.

If in any sense we have the inexhaustible Word of God in the Bible, we shall never be done with this mounting of truth in it to new meanings and fresh force. To some such disclosure of further meaning in the Scriptures we seem pointed by our consideration of the prediction of how the Lord will make His Second Coming. The Scrip-

[1] Compare such books as Kent's "The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus," Rauschenbusch's "The Social Principles of Jesus," etc.

[2] Bacon's "He Opened to Us the Scriptures," reviewed in THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW, July, 1923, p. 368.

[3] *Matthew* vi, 17 on.

tures are to have a close connection with it. The forecast that He would come in the clouds of heaven once found fulfilment in an advent made to the world in the Gospels and in the Scriptures generally. In satisfaction of a similar prediction of His Return He could come again, then, in the same obscured records of His life and teaching, obscured now by alien theologies and creeds, and by the very alteration of the world to our modern civilization; and coming in fresh disclosure of His mind, He would be making His coming "with great power and glory." This is a possible sense, certainly, of the words of the Lord's prediction of His Return. If it is an unexpected form of advent, it goes to the substance nevertheless of prediction and need. If it is an infinitely more rational advent than, in an ecstatic and extravagant reading of the promises, men have expected, and an occurrance far more "in the world," and worthily spiritual, and to the needs of the day, that once more bears witness to the penetration of the Lord's prevision to things essential, and to the simplicity and economy of the Divine provision for men's spiritual life.

At the close of the preceding paper (THE NEW-CHURCH REVIEW, July, 1923) we sketched outlines of the picture which the Lord drew of His Return. He would come again, we concluded, to bring an old day to a close, and to usher in a new for Christianity. Though the disciples carried away from the Lord's discourse the impression that this Return, as well as the Fall of Jerusalem, was near, He Himself said that He knew not the day or the hour, but that these were held secret in the Father's purposes. When He came, however, it would be in triumph, swiftly, on the occurrence of certain conditions, both ominous and auspicious, without superficial observation, and yet in such a way that men could "watch" by being morally and spiritually ready, and by keeping His promise alive. A "sign" would precede His Coming or appearing; that is, there would be some outward testimony to His Return, which, however, would be withdrawn generally from any-

thing but insight and the welcome of moral and spiritual preparedness. These features of the predicted return we summed up last time with a little more fulness and with the addition of references to the discourse in *Mark* xiii, and the like passages in the other synoptic Gospels. This whole summary we need to carry forward. It makes the forecast which the Lord Himself offered of His Return, to which any idea we have of His Return must answer, and which any event or development which we take to be the Second Coming must fulfil. To this summary we have added in this paper the more explicit conception of the manner of the Return which the words in *Mark* xiii, 26, offer us. Guided by the meaning which event gave similar words in the prediction to the high-priest, we should look to see the Lord come again by the Scriptures, giving them, however, a fresh meaning and pertinent power for the day and its spiritual needs. In a Bible, so much obscured by the very progress of the world that we debate writing new ones, He may be expected to come, lifting the Christian mind into a new range of truth and into a deeper experience of the Christian life. Is there any development matching the predictions of the Lord's Return, so understood and summarized? In particular, have the Scriptures been lighted up in any such significant way by Him, so that once again they become the vehicle of His appearing now "with great power and glory"?

William F. Wunsch.

THE AFFECTIONAL APPEAL IN MISSIONARY WORK*

By Edmond Congar Brown

THE question to be discussed in this paper is, "How can we reach the unchurched?" As suggestions for guiding our thought on the subject it has been asked, whether an approach can best be made through present-day interest in psychology, sociology, etc., or by a direct evangelistic appeal; and further, (and this I take it is really the crux of the matter) can we successfully combine an emotional appeal with an intellectual and rational presentation of our doctrines? If I may be permitted to suggest an addition to these questions, or rather to restate the problem in a little different form, I would ask, Have we in the past dwelt too much upon doctrine, upon the intellectual and rational aspect of our wonderful new revelation, and too little upon the affectional and emotional side? Have we stressed too much the Lord as revealed to us intellectually in the Writings, and neglected the Lord as revealed to us affectionally in the Divine Man Jesus, Whose essential nature is love for each one of us, and Whose supreme desire is for the love of each one of us in return? A careful consideration of this question will in my opinion lead to the true solution of how best to bring the New Church to the attention of the masses.

When the Lord Jesus appeared to the eleven, after His resurrection, and reproached them "because they believed

---

* An address prepared at the request of the President of the Alumni Association of the New-Church Theological School, and read at the meeting of that Association on May 8, 1923.

not them which had seen Him," He said unto them: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature" (Mark xvi, 15). And nearly eighteen centuries later, when he called them together in the spiritual world, He again sent them forth as missionaries, commanding them "to preach the Gospel, that the Lord God Jesus Christ reigns" (True Christian Religion, n. 791). Note particularly that on neither of these occasions were they commissioned to preach psychology, or sociology, or anything of that kind, but merely the Gospel, that is, the good news, that the Lord God Jesus Christ reigns. And in the same passage of the "True Christian Religion" it is added: "This was meant by these words of the Lord: He will send His angels, and they shall gather together His elect from one end of the heavens even to the other."

It would seem, therefore, that the way to gather together the elect, to gather into the Church all those who are salvable, to reach with our message the unchurched, is to preach first of all the Gospel that the Lord God Jesus Christ reigns.

The question we as New-Churchmen must answer then is, whether we shall continue the line of missionary effort which has mainly been followed by us ever since the formation of our external organization, or adopt instead what good we can find in the Old Church methods, and revert to something of their emotional, affectional, evangelistic appeal. Shall we continue to address the intellectual Old-Churchman, and endeavor to show him our rational doctrines; or shall we appeal to the world generally, learned and unlearned, adopting the method of Paul (who, whatever else he may have been or not been, was without doubt a most successful missionary preacher) as expressed in his words: "And I, brethren, when I came to you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, declaring unto you the testimony of God, for I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified" (I Cor. ii, 1, 2)? This was the secret of his success, and this is

the key which will open to us today the hearts of mankind: the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ—the preaching of Jesus Christ and Him crucified.

The Lord Himself has pointed this out to us and shown us the way to win souls: "And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me" (John xii, 32)—this having reference to His death on the cross, as is explained in the next verse.

And so, as I see the problem, it is a simple one; and the answer is plain, if we can but read it. The way to reach the unchurched is, to preach to them the Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ and Him crucified. When this has been done, and the heart has been won over to a supreme loyalty to our wonderful Lord Jesus, then will be time enough to discuss the marvellous truths of angelic wisdom which have been revealed to us. It is of course the duty of the priest to teach truths; but we are told that he should love truths because by means of them he leads souls to heaven; and, note particularly, "he leads souls to heaven by means of truths *when he leads them to the Lord*" (Doctrine of Charity, n. 160). The Lord Himself tells us that the first and great thing of all is to love Him with the whole heart. Does not this mean that we must come into that personal heart-touch with Him which He desires beyond all else, and without which, as S. D. Gordon says, "nothing, absolutely nothing, is worth while"?

Now, to preach the Lord Jesus does not of course mean merely to preach that such a Being exists. We must go further, and make His character known. We must tell our hearers what a wonderful loving Jesus He is, and show that He wants more than anything else to have us love Him. We must *introduce* Him to our hearers. In one of the posthumous works of Swedenborg it is said that the first and primary thing of a Church is to know its God, because everything else depends upon that knowledge; that this was the first and primary thing in the conjunction of God with man, and is now the first thing of the New Church (The

Creed of Athanasius, in Apocalypse Explained, Library Edition, vol. VI., p. 498). Other passages teach the same truth, and indeed it is obvious. The idea of God is the foundation of all religion; and according to the fullness and trueness of one's idea of God, so will all of his religion be. How can we expect to reach the unchurched, how can we expect to interest them in our wonderful system of philosophy, and our rational doctrines, unless we first introduce to them our Lord, and tell them something about Him: our "sensitive God," as Mr. Shuster says; our Lord "absolutely beautiful," as Mr. Whittemore has expressed it; or I would say, our loving and lovable Lord—"His mouth is most sweet; yea, He is altogether lovely; this is my beloved, and this is my friend, O daughters of Jerusalem" (Song of Solomon, v. 16)?

There is no method of approach, as our Old-Church friends have demonstrated, which can be compared, for practical result, to this simple story of our Lord—the story of Jesus Christ and Him crucified. The mind of mankind is hungry for it,—

> Tell me the old, old story
> Of Jesus and His love,—

and wants to hear it again and again,—

> Tell me the story often
> For I forget so soon. . . .
>
> Tell me the story always,
> If you would really be
> In any time of trouble
> A comforter to me.

The Lord Himself has set us the example, for on the walk to Emmaus "He expounded to them in all the scriptures the things concerning Himself" (Luke xxiv, 27). The most appealing part of the story of the Lord, is the account of His sufferings and death; and here again we have the Lord's own example before us, for when He appeared to

the eleven in Jerusalem, He explained again the teaching about Himself, and particularly referred to His crucifixion: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day" (Luke xxiv, 46). The Old-Church evangelist uses this story of the cross with powerful effect, often touchng the most hardened hearts, and winning the souls of confirmed sinners to a life of love and devotion to Jesus. He is able to do this because he preaches nothing but Jesus Christ and Him crucified; and we could do as well or much better if we would tell, in our new way, the same wonderful story in all its mystic power.

But in the New Church there are some who fear to use this powerful instrument—the affectional appeal. Some oppose it on principle, while others are in doubt whether or not it constitutes a legitimate line of approach, even in missionary work. It is thought by some that, even granting the apparent great power of this appeal to touch the heart and awaken the interest, the effect is but temporary, and the lesson does not remain after the emotional state of the hearer has passed. But I am convinced that this is a mistake. Our Writings clearly teach that the appeal to the affections is the only method by which truth can be implanted so that it will remain. So far from the effect of such an appeal being temporary, the truth is that this is the only way to produce a permanent effect, the reason being obvious; for, as we are taught, "the understanding does not act at all by itself, does not perceive nor think by itself, *but acts wholly from affections which are of love*" (Divine Love and Wisdom, n. 412), and, further, "in itself the rational is nothing, unless affection flows into it and makes it active and causes it to live" (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1589).

Let us refer to a few passages where the absolute necessity of the affectional appeal is shown:

> Nothing can possibly enter into man's memory and remain there unless there is a certain affection or love which introduces it. (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 3336.)

Nothing which is of doctrine . . . can enter into man, save by means of affections. . . . Affections are what introduce truths, and also dispose them into order. (*Ibid.*, n. 3849.)

All the implantation of truth and good, and also all conjunction, is wrought by means of affection. Truths and goods which are learned, but with which the man is not affected, do indeed enter into the memory, but adhere there as lightly as a feather to a wall, which is blown away by the slightest breath of wind. . . . All the implantation of truth, and the conjunction thereof with good, is effected by means of affection; *and the greater the affection, the stronger the conjunction.* (*Ibid.*, n. 4018.)

The Divine flows only into those things which are of the affection. The truth which is implanted and rooted in a man's interiors is implanted and rooted by affection, and not at all without affection; and the truth which has been implanted and rooted by affection, clings there. (*Ibid.*, n. 5044.)

Similar passages could be cited in great number, but they would be merely cumulative; the truth is taught over and over again, as if to impress upon us a most important point which we might otherwise forget. One more passage, however, I would like to quote, because of the very emphatic way that it states the matter; and I wish particularly to call attention to the teaching that *in no other way can the Lord save man, except by an appeal to his affections:*

It shall now be told why man is led by the Lord by means of affections and not by means of thoughts. When man is led by the Lord by means of affections, he can be led according to all the laws of His Divine Providence; but not if he should be led by means of thoughts. . . . *Affections bring forth thoughts, but thoughts do not bring forth affections.* . . . When affections bring forth thoughts, they bring forth all things of man, because these constitute his life. . . . If you hold a man by his affection, you hold him bound, and lead him wherever you please; and a single reason is then stronger than a thousand. But if you do not hold man by his affection, reasons are of no avail. . . . IN NO OTHER WAY CAN MAN BE SAVED. This follows from what has been said about the laws of Divine Providence and also from this, *that thoughts do not bring forth affections in man.* . . . If man were to be taught from heaven by an influx into his thoughts, it would

be like casting seed upon the way, or into water, or into snow, or into fire. (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1175.)

I think some in the New Church are deterred from using the particular form of affectional appeal which lies in the story of Christ crucified, by the thought that He does not wish us to dwell upon His sufferings and death, but rather upon His glorification. There is a passage in the Writings which is thought to support this view; but I believe it has been most unfortunately misunderstood, with the result that we have not used one of the most effective weapons in our missionary campaign. The passage I refer to is "Apocalypse Explained," n. 476, the closing sentence of which reads, as usually translated: "nor is any angel permitted to think of the Lord's passion, but only of His glorification, and the reception by Him of the Divine." Can it be possible that the angels are forbidden to reflect upon the sufferings and death of the Lord? I do not think so. And upon examining the Latin of this passage we find that it is open to another quite different interpretation. The passage in the original reads: *nec licet alicui angelo cogitare de passione Domini, sed de glorificatione Ipsius, et de receptione Divini Ipse.* Now, while not wishing to pose as a Latin expert, which I am not, I think I can safely affirm that the Latin word *"sed"* is a word of much broader scope than the English word "but." As I understand the matter, *"sed"* was derived rom *"sine,"* or at least is tied up with it in some way, so that its basic idea is "without"; making the thought of this passage, that the angels are not allowed to think of the Lord's passion *without* thinking of His glorification. However this may be, Andrews' "Lexicon" gives a number of meanings for *"sed,"* including the "but only" of our passage as translated above; and it explains that another common use is, "after negative clauses, to limit the negative element, i.e., to indicate that the assertion does not hold good at all, but something else does instead; or else that it is not exclusively true, but something else holds good in addition [and that the meaning then is], 'but, on the

contrary,' and in an ascending signification, 'but also,' 'but even,' 'but in fact,' etc." So we see that it would be equally permissible, if indeed not preferable etymologically, to translate the passage: "nor is any angel permitted to think of the Lord's passion, *unless also* of His glorification, and the reception by Him of the Divine."

But whatever the best translation of this passage is, and whatever the prohibition may be as to angels, this and any other similar teaching cannot apply to our missionary preaching here on earth. The Old Testament is full of allusions to the Lord's passion; the New Testament tells of it in great detail, the Lord's sufferings and death being described with a power of emotional appeal which is unparalleled in history or literature. The use of this appeal in missionary preaching and exhortation was the means by which the Old Christian Church was built up; and the neglect of this appeal is, in my opinion, the reason why the New Christian Church is still confined to so very few. Think of it: the Church in which all the Lord's hopes are centered, the end of all His efforts since the creation of the world, even now, though nearing its second century mark, known only to a few thousand out of the earth's teeming millions!

Another reason why we have been reluctant to stress the affectional appeal in missionary work has been our misunderstanding (so it seems to me) of the symbolic description of the New Jerusalem in the Apocalypse. In John's vision he saw the Holy City descending out of heaven; and besides many other particulars, we are told that the angel measured it, and that the length and the breadth and the height of it were equal. We have regarded this account as constituting our building specifications for the Holy City, the Church we are trying to build here on earth, and properly so; but, strange as it may seem, for some unexplained reason we have failed to study carefully the architect's explanatory notes of these specifications. We know that length corresponds to the good of love, breadth

corresponds to truth from that good, and height to good and truth together in every degree; and we have assumed that in the New Church love, or the affectional side, truth, or the intellectual side, and use, or the practical working side, are of equal importance, and must be present in equal degree. We have realized that in the evangelistic work of the Old Church the affectional side has predominated; and believing that this is an error, and that we must avoid the mistakes of the Old Church, we have gone to the other extreme, and stressed the teaching that the Church is a Church from doctrine; we have discouraged the appeal to the affections, the excitation of the religious emotions, the dwelling upon the intensely lovable, human, homely, side of our Lord's character; we have believed it derogatory to His majesty to remember that He actually became, and still is, "one of us"; we have been so engrossed in trying to understand the incomprehensible arcana of the Divine Love and Wisdom that we have neglected our Divine-Human lover Jesus, who ever stands at the door and knocks, desiring only that we may open and invite Him in.

But in this particular we have been wrong, and the Old-Church evangelist has been right. The truth of doctrine is *not* of equal importance with the good of love, much less is it of primary importance. So long as a man regards the truth of doctrine as in the first place, he is like unripe fruit (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 84). If we read carefully not only our building specifications but also the explanatory notes, we shall see clearly that in the Holy City the *length* is of the *first importance. We must fix the length first;* we cannot have breadth or height unless we first have length. We must cultivate and develop and give free play to the affectional side of our religious life, before we can hope either to have any understanding of doctrine or to perform any real use. And in our missionary endeavors if we would win souls for the New Church, we must preach first Jesus Christ and Him crucified, before we attempt to secure an intellectual acceptance of our rational doctrines. In a word,

we must write upon our hearts in letters of fire the reminder that the first and great Commandment is to love the Lord Jesus Christ with the whole heart.

But let us consider the authority for this interpretation of the relative importance of the three dimensions of the Holy City. Here are some of the passages:

> And he measured the city with a reed twelve thousand stadia. The length, and the breadth, and the height of it were equal, signifies the quality of that Church from doctrine shown, *that all things of it were from the good of love.* . . . The reason why "the length and breadth and height of it are equal" signifies that all things are from the good of love, is because "length," which signifies the good of love, precedes, and "the breadth" is equal to it, thus as is "the length" so also is "the height." . . . That by these three being equal, is signified that all things of that Church are from the good of love, appears also from what follows, for it is said that "the city was pure gold like unto pure glass" (verse 18); and also that "the street of the city was pure gold like pellucid glass" (verse 21), and by gold is signified the good of love. (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 907.)

> That all things of heaven and of the Church are from the good of love, and the good of love is from the Lord, cannot be seen, and therefore it cannot be known, unless it be demonstrated. . . . [The demonstration then follows, after which the argument proceeds.] This is the reason why *the learned have attributed all things to thought and not to the affection;* and why the Church has attributed all things to faith, and not to love; when, nevertheless, the truth, which at this day in the Church is said to be of good faith, or is called faith, *is only the form of good which is of love.* . . . And I can assert, *that there does not exist a grain of truth, which in itself is truth in man, except so far as it is from the good of love from the Lord.* (*Ibid.*, n. 908.)

> *The all of the New Church,* which is the New Jerusalem, is the *good of love from the Lord.* (*Ibid.*, n. 912.)

> Every truth of that Church and of its doctrine is in form the good of love flowing in together with light out of heaven from the Lord. (*Ibid.*, n. 917.)

It is also very significant that it was necessary, in order that John might be able even to see the Holy City in vision,

that he should first be raised into a celestial or affectional state, represented by his being "carried away in the spirit to a great and high mountain" (Apocalypse Revealed, n. 896).

I hope I have not been too prolix along this line of thought. I am trying to make plain my earnest conviction that we must completely revise our idea of what constitutes our Church, and, consequent upon this, our methods of missionary appeal to the masses. The message which the Lord has given to us to give to them is not just what we have supposed; and our methods must be modified accordingly. The message we are commissioned to deliver is not primarily our philosophy or our rational doctrine, wonderful though that be. It is the message of the wondrous love of God. It is the same message that the Old-Church evangelist tries to deliver, and does deliver, though in a halting and imperfect way: "God so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." It is the same old message—the same old Gospel of Jesus Christ and Him crucified; but *we* have the power and the wonderful privilege of telling it in a new way; for while the Old-Church evangelist can tell only of the Man crucified, we can tell that this Man was a human nature assumed by Jehovah God and joined to Himself in mystic union, and that by the life and sufferings of this Man and by His final passion on the cross He became one with Jehovah. They can only say, *Ecce Homo!* while we can joyfully cry, *Ecce Deus!*

Let me urge all New-Churchmen, with all the earnestness of which I am capable, not to neglect the opportunity which the Lord Jesus has given us to work with Him in establishing the New Church. Let us not ignore the material which He has had recorded for us to use in our efforts to win souls to Him—the touching story of His sufferings and death. Let us not imagine that any other appeal can ever be as effective as the preaching of "Jesus Christ and Him Crucified"! It is said by some that for a New-Churchman the true vision of the Lord is that seen by John, and described

in the first chapter of the Apocalypse. This was a symbolic representation of the glorified Lord; and most wonderful it was. But let us not forget that later John was also shown the symbolic representation of the crucified Lord—"a Lamb as it had been slain," to whom the living creatures and the elders sang the new song, "For Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood"; and that the ten thousand times ten thousand angels around the throne joined in the loud cry, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain!" And let us note very thoughtfully, that it was not the glorified Lord who is symbolically represented as opening the book and loosing the seals thereof, that is, revealing the internal sense of the Word, but it is the Lamb who was slain. He it was who "came and took the book out of the right hand of Him who sat upon the throne," and of whom it was said, "Thou art worthy to take the book and to open the seals thereof, for Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood" (Rev. v, 6-9). There are other references in the Apocalypse to the death of the Lord on the cross and the shedding of His blood,—as for instance i, 7, vii, 14, xix, 13; all symbolic and representative, it is true, but still constantly referring to and bringing back the heart of the reader to the great sacrifice made by our crucified Redeemer.

By all means let us stress Jesus Christ and Him Glorified. There are many intellectual, cultured, rational minds which can be reached by means of this message. But to the great mass of mankind the real appeal will always be the wonderful story of Jesus Christ and Him Crucified. This must come to them first; the other, later, when they can understand it,—if not in this world, then in the next. The Lord Himself taught this, cautioning His disciples, although they themselves knew Him to be the Christ and even had witnessed His transfiguration, not to preach this prematurely unto the multitude, because it was necessary *first* that He should suffer many things and finally die on the cross. (See Matt. xvi, 20, 21, xvii, 9; Mark viii, 29-31, ix, 9; Luke ix, 20-22.) And this is still true today. For the

great mass of mankind it is absolutely necessary that the heart should be touched by the story of the death of Jesus, before the understanding is prepared to accept the rational doctrine of the glorification of this same Jesus and His unition with Jehovah. This is why the story of His sufferings and death is recorded for us in the New Testament with such a wealth and detail of emotional appeal.

In closing I would like to touch briefly on the matter from a purely doctrinal point of view. What I have said above in favor of the emotional appeal in missionary work has been in itself more an appeal than a reasoned argument. But having made my appeal, let me connect it with our doctrine, and show that it has a basis in our revealed rational truth.

I want to direct our thoughts for a moment to one of the great, distinctive, fundamental doctrines of the New Church,—the doctrine of Conjugial Love,—and point out its application to the subject under consideration.

The Church has always had (the Christian, and even the sensual perverted Jewish Church, though most obscurely) the wonderful conception of the relation of the Lord to the soul as that of Bridegroom and Bride—that the Creator is also the Husband. And there has always been a dim perception of the truth that the marriage relation of man and woman in some way mystically simulates the marriage of the Lord and the soul. But it has been reserved for the New Church to teach the doctrine of Conjugial Love in its fullness, and as a part of this doctrine to show forth in clear light the relation of the human marriage of man and wife to the heavenly marriage of the Lord and the human soul. Let us briefly recall to mind these points so that we may see what my argument is based upon:—that the relation of the Lord to the human soul is the real marriage relation, and the marriage of man and wife is a correspondence or representation of that; and that while we must not try to reduce the real thing to the external form of its symbol, and think of the first as the similitude of the nec-

essarily corporeal form of the letter, we must still realize that since one is a correspondence of the other, everything that is interiorly true of one must also be true of the other.

Now do we not all know that the real, essential characteristic of a true human marriage is a deep, warm, passionate stirring of the affections? Intellectual appreciation by each of the other there must be, of course, and a certain degree of unanimity in rational understanding of truth; but the primary and basic and absolutely essential thing is, a deep, yearning love, a desire for conjunction, a profound emotion or stirring of the heart. When a young man courts a maiden, he knows by a heaven-implanted instinct that, if he would win her, he must address her heart and not her mind; he must employ, not rational arguments, but the affectional appeal. Our Writings recognize this, saying that it is orderly for the man to courteously, kindly and deferentially woo and solicit his chosen one for the sweet addition to his life which he desires (Conjugial Love, n. 297); they say nothing about his bringing rational arguments into play. And if he win her, and they enter into a true marriage of conjugial love, then "the wife sees nothing more lovely than the man, and the man nothing more lovely than the wife; yea, nothing more lovely do they hear, smell and touch" (*Ibid.*, n. 213). For their hearts have been touched by the mystic power of conjugial love, which is "nothing else than that two will to be one, that is, will that two lives shall be one life" (*Ibid.*, n. 215). What would an earthly marriage be without emotion? What would it be if it were not begun and continually revivified by the affectional appeal?

Now if all this is true of the earthly marriage, the symbol and correspondence, must it not also be true in even greater measure of the more perfect marriage between the Lord and the soul? Must this not also be essentially an affectional relation? If it were not, then the human marriage would not be so. And the Lord, in wooing the human soul to Himself, uses, just as He teaches the human lover to use, the

affectional appeal. He stands at the door of our heart and knocks, for "in no other way can man be saved" (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1175). And so it follows that His servants,—His priests, missionaries, evangelists and lay workers,—seeking to co-operate with Him in the winning of human souls to His love, must work with Him in His way, and use His method—the deep, warm, affectional appeal to the human heart.

Just one final thought. If we ever feel doubt of the wisdom of preaching the wonderful story of the Lord's suffering and death, if we ever fear that it is derogatory to His majesty to represent Him as suffering, grieving, dying on the cross, let us remember His own impressive censure of this state of mind. On the occasion recorded in Matthew xvi, 21-23, when He had been telling His disciples "how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed," Peter objected,—no doubt feeling, as some do today, that to think such things of Him was irreverent and derogatory,—and said to Jesus, "Be it far from Thee, Lord, this shall not be unto Thee." But Jesus turned to Peter, and emphatically rebuked him, saying, "Get thee behind Me, Satan, thou art an offence unto Me, for thou savorest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men."

May our dear Lord Jesus help us always to be true to Him, and to keep warm in our hearts the memory of His sufferings and death endured for us; and may He help us to tell the story to others, winning them to Him by the only possible means—the affectional appeal!

EDMOND CONGAR BROWN.

THE OLD TESTAMENT MISSION OF THE JEWS*

By Miss Ednah C. Silver

MY specific topic is "The Old Testament Mission of the Jews," beginning at Genesis xii. But I beg leave to glance for a moment at the opening chapter—a subject of much controversy. The account of creation, partially incorporated in various early myths, is by common consent of scholars a very ancient bit of writing. What, in brief, is the story? God created the earth including the vegetable and animal kingdoms, placed lights in the sky to serve it, and brought man into being as His crowning work. In short, He wanted a place for His children, and as a powerful home-making God He loves us.

Not only children, peasants, and our grandmothers believed this story to be the Word of God, but people at large accepted it during long centuries. Faith was a bit shaken by Copernicus, who taught that our earth is not the center of all things; and faith received a harder blow from the geologists. We actually see stratified rock in the making —sandbeds slowly becoming sandstone through pressure, others by deposition in water. Enormous beds of strata require immeasurable æons of time; how could the world have been made in six days?

Before rejecting the Divine claim of authorship, it is only fair to ask the purpose of the narrative. Did the writer aim to produce a treatise on cosmogony? If so, its science being faulty, its author is finite and fallible. Might it be a spiritual parable clothed in astronomical form? Instantly the critic arises and asks, Why is it archaic, and not

* A talk on salient points of the religious history of the Hebrews, given to a club of women of various faiths organized as a literature class. It was not written out until after the event.

in twentieth century form? The answer is easy: Astronomy in our day, being subject to progress and revision, would be archaic in the twenty-fifth century. Moreover, modern science, given long ago, would have been rejected by every one, and of use nowhere. Whoever wrote that chapter showed wisdom in adapting it to the archaic mind of the reader, the outer form of a pure parable being a minor matter. As a parable, might it teach, not of the evolution of a planet, but of the evolution of the human soul? How does the chapter open?

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth."

Might this teach that in the beginning with each of us God creates a heavenly plane of the mind and an earthly plane of the mind? This is a good beginning for the evolution or development of man's higher nature.

We turn now to our subject, "The Old Testament Mission of the Jews." We begin the historic story as recorded, hearing the Bible's claim for itself, and judging it by internal evidence. It seems that Jehovah would start a new stream of influence, with banks purposely a bit narrow and circumscribed. From Abram He would build a new race. I do not object to their being called a chosen people. Each of us is chosen for a special place, great or small, in the Divine economy of the universe, which he may neglect, but no one else can fill. Elements may be found in this early people to which we object; but we should always remember what religions it endeavored to supplant. I will mention three.

First, that of Phœnicia, home of the most civilized of the Canaanitish tribes. Degrading elements were found in their very worship. It would not be possible to poison more effectually organized religion at its source than to have its devotional exercises low in tone. Phœnicia's chief goddess was Astarte. Who was she? Enter with me the Sargent room of the Boston Public Library. Face the frieze of the Hebrew prophets. Turn to the right. Astarte is the central

figure, beautiful, alluring, in diaphanous robe. What is under her feet? The youths and maidens whom she has crushed to death morally.

Second, the religion of Egypt. Go with me seven hundred miles up the Nile, and observe the deities in statue or bas-relief; or to the British Museum, and see the same pictured on Egyptian papyri. What chiefly impresses the thoughtful observer? The gods with heads of crocodile, hawk, bull, or cat. We see Khnemu, the ram-headed god, making man out of clay. We find Anubis, the jackal-headed god, watching the balance when souls are weighed at the Judgment after death. If we are making a symbolic image of a god, can we do worse than to depict a human body with an animal head? It suggests that the animal nature dominates the human.

Third, the religion of Greece. Homer was nearly contemporary with the Hebrew King Solomon. His story, drawn from vastly older material, was the pagan Bible to the multitude. Let us select Aphrodite, whom the Romans called Venus, from his hierarchy of gods. A learned work, Professor Seymour's "Life in the Homeric Age," defines Aphrodite as the goddess of love, fitted for works of marriage. I will take two incidents of her life directly out of Homer. She goes to Sparta, and tempts Helen to leave her husband Menelaus and to go away with Paris. She thus wrecks a home. Later, we find her at Troy. The tenth year of the war has opened. All are wearied. A single combat is arranged whose decision shall be final, and end the war. The champions, of course, are Menelaus, the injured husband, for Greece; and Paris, the treacherous guest, for Troy. The contest begins. Menelaus will evidently win, when Aphrodite, with supernatural power, interferes, and carries off Paris to safety. At Sparta, Aphrodite broke a marriage contract; at Troy, she breaks an international contract.

In contrast with paganism what will the Jewish religion do for the world?

We turn now to the twelfth chapter of Genesis. Terah, Abram's father, with his household, has left Ur, near the site of ancient Babylon, and swept up the Euphrates to Haran. Here Abram hears a call from Jehovah. May it be an inner dictate? He is to leave his country, kindred, and his father's house, and go to Canaan where his descendants will become a great nation. Dean Stanley compares him to an Arab sheik. I have seen a worthy one, with fine intelligent countenance, well armed, erect, riding a noble Arabian horse, a born leader of men. In Abram's day two months were consumed in going from Haran to Canaan. In the unchanged East thirty years ago matters were the same. The railway from Damascus to Beirut was not built until 1895.

It took courage for our first California pioneers to cross the uncharted continent. Abram, in unquestioning obedience, does not demur. Picture him at the head of a striking caravan which includes his wife, with his nephew Lot, with souls he had gotten in Haran, with his little army of trained men born in his house, and with camels bearing tents, cooking utensils, food and fodder. Skirting the desert he reaches Damascus on the traveled highway from Asia to Egypt. I visited the city in March, 1902. Come with me for a view from a height outside the town. Those masses of pink are almond trees in full bloom. The masses of soft green are cacti. The fig is putting forth its leaf. In May the orchard, vineyard, garden and field will burst into abundance. We trace the Abana and Pharpar rivers until they end in the Meadow Lakes.

Abram continues southward, probably crossing the Jordan ford midway between the Sea of Galilee and the Dead Sea. What is his first act upon reaching Shechem? He builds an altar of wayside stones, familiar at home. Outwardly the same, how does the altar west of the Jordan differ from the altar east of the Euphrates? The new one represents worship of Jehovah the One God. In Mesopotamia they worship other gods. Here is struck the domi-

nant note which reverberates through the Hebrew Scripture for sixteen centuries all the way to Malachi: monotheism over against polytheism.

Famine drives Abram, his wife, and Lot to Egypt, the land of useful sciences. Its civilization is already old. We will visit the pyramid of Cheops. Its height is nearly five hundred feet; each side at the base is longer. It is of brick enclosing mysterious chambers. It covers thirteen acres. No one from the apex can throw a stone which will clear the base. It is faced entire with huge blocks of granite or basalt nearly three feet high, correspondingly deep, and very long. We trace them to the quarry where they were sawn into shape by bronze saws set with jewels (Encyclopædia Britannica, vol. xxii, p. 685). But no living engineer can tell how these blocks were lifted by hand power at a time when mechanical apparatus was simple. Abram can gather much instruction in this land; and Pharaoh grows friendly, bestowing upon him valuable gifts.

Abram comes out of Egypt rich in cattle, silver and gold; and his nephew also has flocks and herds and tents. And there is strife between Abram's herdsmen and Lot's herdsmen. Here is a beautiful spiritual lesson. Abram represents our higher nature, Lot, our lower nature and its pleasures which captivate. Observe that the friction is all on the side of Lot. Abram is tranquil: "Let there be no strife between thee and me." He accords liberty of action: "Is not the whole land before thee? Separate thyself." Lot can see as well as Abram the wide area around them; for we are capable of lifting our understanding for a short time above the level of our usual horizon. Lot characteristically chooses the plain below, and moves his tent to Sodom, where the men are "wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly"; and he is taken captive. We also, if we pitch our tent dangerously near to temptation, may become captive.

Chedorlaomer, with minor kings, and an army, comes from the far East to reassert his authority over rebellious

Canaan. He sweeps down the east shore of the Jordan, weakening the enemy's allies on the way; he rounds the foot of the Dead Sea, comes up the west side of the river, wages war successfully with native Canaanitish kings, includes Lot among his captives, and returns by the same circuitous route. Abram becomes aware of Lot's captivity,—for our higher nature can look down and see what happens below. Commanding his little band of three hundred and eighteen armed men, he marches straight across the country, showing good military tactics. Pursuing the foe toward Damascus, he recovers Lot. Likewise will God rescue us from spiritual captivity through the instrumentality of our higher nature. Observe that Chedorlaomer's route is indirect and obscure, but the action of Abram is characteristically direct and straight.

To Abraham, whose name has been lengthened, and to his wife Sarah, is born a son, Isaac. And we read that Jehovah commands the sacrifice of the lad at Moriah. This rock, once the site of Solomon's Temple, is in our day enclosed within the Mosque of Omar at Jerusalem. Enter with me. In the center of the edifice the dome of this living rock rises six feet above the level of the floor. Its visible area is forty by sixty feet. In Abraham's day the spot is open and wild. He builds the altar, lays the wood, binds his son, places him thereon, and holds the knife to strike, when the act is suddenly arrested by the angel of Jehovah, saying, "Lay not thine hand upon the lad." And a ram is offered in Isaac's place.

Observe that Jehovah in building up this new race and nation does not sweep away existing civilization and begin *de novo* after the manner desired by the radicals in the French Revolution. He even permits pagan customs; but the altar is lifted to monotheism; and the dramatic rescue of Isaac is a living object lesson against human sacrifice. Animal offerings are a cumbersome form of worship suited to a rude age, but with an appeal to unselfishness. Lambs without blemish, the fairest of the flock, are for the Most

High; no offerings that are blind, or broken, or maimed.

Abraham, desiring for Isaac a marriage alliance with his own Mesopotamian kindred, sends thither his chief steward to arrange it. I have thrown into juvenile verse the most beautiful betrothal story in all literature.

A line of camels in olden time
To the far Euphrates went,
With pretty jewels and fabrics rare
To the fair Rebekah sent.

Will the camels bring her back with them?
(For they must not long delay.)
Would she like to carry the sunshine
To a new home far away?

Will she go to gladden a lonely tent?
"I will go," the maiden said,
For the Lord had prospered the journey,
And His angel the way had led.

And Isaac was glad at her coming,
For he loved her, the Scripture saith,
And his sorrowing heart was comforted
After his mother's death.

In the sixty-seven verses of this twenty-fourth chapter of Genesis we touch upon three points. An angel leading the way suggests that happy marriages are made in heaven. Freedom for women is in the air to-day; but go back four thousand years, and see that Rebekah is given entire liberty of choice in the supreme event of her life. She is to be trusted, for she was the first to receive the offer, and to see the jewels of gold outside the city when at the well with her pitcher. And observe, she ran and told her mother.

This new people leads at least a semi-nomadic life. Isaac's son Jacob is a plain man dwelling in tents. Jacob's sons are feeding their flocks at Dothan when they wickedly

sell their brother. Joseph, the captive, is carried to Egypt, rises through vicissitudes to a place close to royalty, and becomes (in modern phrase) economic administrator for the nation, storing the corn for future distribution. Famine drives Jacob's other sons to Egypt. Joseph had changed beyond recognition, but he knew them. He did not smooth matters over, but said with frank clearsightedness, "Ye meant evil against me." But he added at the last, "Fear ye not; I will nourish you and your little ones." And he comforted them and spake kindly to them.

In the meantime Jacob, bereft of his children, threatens to carry his gray hairs in sorrow to the grave. Joseph, by royal command, sends his eleven brethren to Canaan with wagons to bring back their wives, their children, and their father, seventy souls in all, and to give them the best of the land called Goshen. It lies between Cairo and Ismailia on the Suez Canal, and is fertile to-day.

Three words arrest special attention in the Joseph story of twelve chapters. We read in Genesis xlvii, 10, that "*Jacob blessed Pharaoh.*" How strange! Who was Jacob on his arrival? A shepherd, hungry and homeless. Who was Pharaoh? Ruler over the most powerful country on the face of the earth. Should not the blessing be bestowed by the strong monarch on his starving beneficiary? But there is another point of view. Jacob's altar represents worship of Jehovah, the One Only God. Pharaoh's land of Egypt is of lower significance. It is fitting that the blessing for mutual union should descend from the spiritually superior Jacob to the spiritually inferior Pharaoh.

Analyze one verse more. In Genesis xli, 40, Pharaoh, on promoting Joseph, says, "Only in the throne will I be greater than thou." Yes, the king should reign in his external-minded kingdom where we largely live, the land of building construction, domestic science, and bookkeeping—the land of *this-world* activities. Pharaoh seems greater, but Joseph's power is on a higher plane. Picture in your mind a bank officer balancing the company's accounts. He

adds up the figures with the Egyptian part of his mind. Where is Joseph? Within and above him, urging him to add the figures righteously, and not camouflage them (falsify the books) for the sake of unrighteous gain. Pharaoh should be submissive and subordinate.

The Book of Exodus announces a new king who "knew not Joseph." He fears the multiplying of the exclusive Jews, who do not merge into the melting pot of Egypt; and he afflicts them with heavy burdens. In 1902 I looked upon the mummy of Rameses Second near Cairo as that of the Pharaoh of the Oppression; but a possible rival arises after more than thirty centuries in the mummy of Tut-ankh-amen near Luxor. Time may reveal to whom belongs the honor or dishonor of setting cruel taskmasters over the Israelites.

Pharaoh next orders the death of all male Hebrew children as soon as born. Little Moses providentially escapes; and his mother impresses on his tender mind a sense of his race and his religion. Pharaoh's daughter has compassion on the Hebrew child, adopts him, and brings him up at court. At forty years of age he sees an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew. He slays the enemy, and hides the body in the sand. Later, he attempts pacification between warring Hebrews. But he is not yet ripe enough to settle disagreements even among his own. He incurs the wrath of Pharaoh, and flees to Midian. Where is Midian? I hold up two diverging fingers, which stand for the gulfs of the Red Sea stretching northward. The V-shaped space between is the peninsula of Sinai enclosing Midian on the east where Moses lived for many years.

In the meantime Pharaoh dies, and his successor is even more rigorous toward the Israelites. In return, he is afflicted by Jehovah with dire calamities or plagues. Moses, having been called back by Jehovah, warns and entreats the king, whose heart is alternately hardened and softened. At last, the firstborn of the Egyptians in every house is smitten by death. In contrast, the fatal messenger passes over the

Israelites' dwellings, and they, in commemoration, establish the feast of the Passover. Finally, Pharaoh says, "Go, serve the Lord as ye have said" (Exodus xii, 11, 12, 30, 31). Led by Moses, the Israelites reach the Red Sea gulf, where the Suez Canal now starts northward. And Pharaoh, unsteady of spirit, again grows hard, and pursues them with war chariots into the Sea, where all his forces perish miserably in the waves. In Exodus xv, 1-22, we have a Song of Deliverance, rendered in part antiphonally by Moses and his men, answered by Miriam and the women. (See Moulton's "Literary Study of the Bible," pp. 138-145).

The Israelites continue their journey to Sinai, which furnishes great plains for encampment within sight of Horeb or Moses' Mount. Here the Israelites sojourn a year; and the narrative sets forth an extensive ecclesiasticism. In all these centuries since Abram's day a Jewish priest has never been mentioned. The patriarch conducts the religious life of his people. Now, a high priest is appointed by Jehovah, with minor priests, whose vestments are carefully prescribed. A Tabernacle, or movable tent for worship, is built according to a Divine pattern. It is rectangular, enclosing two rooms, the larger for priestly rites, and the inner sanctuary, or Holy of Holies, for the Ark, a gilded chest containing the two tables of stone given Moses on the Mount.

Here the textual critic of the Bible arises, and scatters the Book of Exodus over a wide range of years. I only reply that, whenever introduced, the ecclesiasticism is an interesting factor in the history of Israel. Again the critic is heard. He asks, "Why these prohibitions in the Decalogue regarding murder and theft issued from Mt. Sinai amid dramatic thunderings, lightnings and the noise of trumpets? They were not new." I instantly concede, "You are right." The old cities of that day, Memphis and Thebes, had long had laws for the protection of life and property. But the citizen may be held back by the police-

man's eye, by fear of fines, or imprisonment. The command from Sinai makes these evils a sin against God, and elevates the edict from the civil to the religious plane, from the outer restraint of fear to the inner restraint of conscience.

Observe in this Scriptural narrative that the Israelites who entered Goshen as simple herdsmen or shepherds, are now cunning artificers. They are able metal workers, the mitre of the high priest and the cover of the Ark adorned with cherubim being of pure gold. Skilful dyeing, spinning, weaving, and embroidery are shown in the hangings of the Tabernacle. Wood-workers fit the upright planks of the building, across which are three horizontal rows of rings, at the top, the middle, and the bottom. Rods inserted in these rings bind the planks together. We go to the Boston Museum of Fine Arts to see a corner of the Parthenon restored. We should go to the Cambridge Semitic Museum, and study the corner of the Tabernacle restored; or see pictures of it in Timothy O. Paine's "Holy Houses" of Scripture, published by Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Observe how Jehovah makes the wrath of man to praise Him. Everything which the wicked Pharaoh does, advances the cause of the very Israelites he is trying to destroy. He unwittingly helps them at every turn. He condemns little Moses to death; but the monarch's own daughter adopts him and rears him at court, where he studies at first hand the science of government, as befits a future law-giver and leader. Again, driven by the wrathful Pharaoh into Midian, Moses reverts to type, turns shepherd, leads his flock to Mount Horeb (Exodus iii, 1), and learns the topography of Sinai for the future benefit of his people. Pharaoh forces the Israelites out of Goshen for treasure-city-building, and brings them into contact with skilled civilization.

When finally called by Moses, the Israelites do not emerge from Goshen a chaotic mob. How could he have led such through the intricate wanderings in the wilder-

ness? They are highly organized. How? As a military regiment is composed of ten companies. O yes, they have preserved their tribal divisions with a recognized head for each; and in directions for encampment, they fall easily into the prescribed place. The Israelites are led through long wanderings to the Jordan with striking manifestations of the Divine Presence. Moses sees a glimpse of the desired land, but dies without crossing the river. Previously he has assigned land on the east side to a portion of Israel; and Joshua completes the division beyond Jordan to the remaining portion, as the inheritance promised them by Jehovah. Joshua is a soldier, he finds the native tribes lacking cohesion, and he partially completes the military conquest of the land (Joshua xi, 15-23; xxiv). He is followed by a line of Judges.

This story of the Israelites begins with the patriarchs, followed by the group of tribes. After their expansion in the land of Canaan they must grow into a distinct nation; and portions of Leviticus and Deuteronomy embody laws which cover practically every relationship between man and man. Jehovah commands prompt payment by the employer, saying, "The wages of him that is hired shall not abide with thee all night until the morning." Jehovah restrains the gossip, saying, "Thou shalt not go up and down as a tale-bearer among the people." He puts a touch of humanity into the current custom of slavery; He enjoins the offer of freedom to the Hebrew slave at the end of seven years' service, saying, "Thou shalt not let him go away empty, thou shalt furnish him liberally out of thy flock, and out of thy threshing floor, and out of thy winepress."

The Hebrew Samuel rises into prominence at the close of the line of Judges. Like many a Biblical character, he is to me a living, breathing personality. I am reminded of Adolph Thiers of France, because both see great political changes among their people. Thiers lives under two Bonapartes and three Bourbons, becoming himself president of the French Republic in 1871. Samuel ministers unto the

Lord as a child under the High Priest Eli, opening the doors of the temple, and hearing the words of the Lord. As a man, he visits the schools of the prophets, making the circuit yearly. As a judge he comes into close contact with Israel. He hears their dissatisfaction over the Theocracy which has Jehovah as its head, and he rebukes their clamor for an earthly king. (I Samuel viii.) Later, he anoints in advance both Saul and David.

King Saul proves disobedient, and Jehovah designates David, the son of Jesse, to succeed him on the throne. This throws Saul's son Jonathan, the Crown Prince, out of the succession. And yet he loves David as his own soul, and often protects his life against Saul's wrath. This is not the way that political rivals treat each other at the present day, according to the newspapers.

Jonathan is a high light in human nature. His noble self-effacement is like Joseph's great-hearted forgiveness of his brethren. But if high lights in human nature are to be found only in remote Scripture story, then is the Bible written in vain. Come with me, and see Grant and Lee in 1865 at Appomattox. The Confederate General with his army has suffered final defeat. His sword is the emblem of his cause, and its relinquishment would bring the keenest of mental agony. General Grant has consideration for the feelings of his opponent, and studies how to avoid even the remotest allusion to the subject. Finally, he writes this, as one of the terms of surrender: "All officers shall retain their side arms." This admirable magnanimity is one of the high lights of human nature.

David is at first minstrel and armor-bearer at Saul's court, but later becomes a refugee from the royal anger. He is an inspired writer, saying, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His Word was in my tongue." Many of the Psalms, our precious instrumentalities for devotion, were written through him. After many vicissitudes, he becomes king of Israel; but he is essentially a warrior bent on the full possession of Canaan. Jerusalem is still in the

hands of the Jebusites. Its stronghold is the south-western corner, where nature furnishes a military moat in the deep broad valley on two sides, strengthened by living rock projecting upwards. David's men scale the walls, and capture the fortress. He makes Jerusalem his civic capital, and also the religious center, by bringing to the Tower of David the Ark containing the Tables of the Law, accompanied by singing and shouting, by harp and cymbal, cornet and trumpet. Here the Ark remains until transferred to the Temple.

King Solomon, son of David, during his long reign of peace fulfils his father's thwarted project to erect a Temple to Jehovah. It is the Tabernacle enlarged and enriched, built from the pattern given in the Mount. The dedication is recorded in I Kings viii; and fifty-six of its sixty-six verses are devoted to exercises led by Solomon. He is only a layman; why this prominence?

Let us get first the worldly point of view. Solomon is the super-man of Israel. His country is at the height of its earthly glory. Within the Temple area he erects for the administration of justice a pillared structure of costly stones adorned with targets of beaten gold. Thirteen years are required for building his own palace to whose imperial magnificence the Queen of Sheba testifies (I Kings x). He forms a pact with the good King Hiram of Tyre, rich in Phœnician workmen, for building a merchant marine at the head of the eastern gulf of the Red Sea. No Straits of Gibraltar, or doubling the Cape of Good Hope, for the completed ships; they sail down the Red Sea, past Arabia rich in traffic, and enter the Indian Ocean, importing apes, peacocks, gold, etc.

Solomon is great, but not good. Without help from heaven he cannot give the dedicatory prayer in the Temple. He presents the Omnipresence of God: "The heaven of heavens cannot contain Thee; how much less this house which I have builded!" Observe how royalty is lost in contrite petition for sins: "Hear Thou in heaven Thy

dwelling place; and when Thou hearest, forgive." There is a touch of prophecy in his reference to the sighing of the prisoners, suggesting the coming national captivity. Verses 41-43 are distinctly greater than Solomon, and almost greater than his circumscribed religion. There is a note of universality in his prayer for equal blessing upon the stranger from afar, "who is not of Thy people Israel."

In the meantime, where are the priests? They are overlooked by us near the beginning of the chapter. The Ark has been brought up from the fortress of David. Within it is nothing save the two tables of stone which Moses received at Horeb. The priests now bear it on their shoulders through the outer courts into the Temple; and it is deposited in the inner shrine or Most Holy Place. This is the chief act of dedication, for the glory of the Lord now fills the house. What is the Decalogue? It is the epitome of religion—love to God and to the neighbor.

There is a spiritual reason why fifty-six verses of this chapter are devoted to Solomon, and less than ten to the priests. Solomon in his purely official capacity as king represents the reign of truth under which we must all serve. Truth may be proclaimed on the housetops; it may properly be in evidence, and at the front, filling a large space. But priests, because of their office, represent love or good in the heart, hidden, unseen, and of few words, but potent to influence our motives, and stir devotional feeling.

King Solomon's domain of sovereignty is divided after his death. The northern kingdom of Israel with its spurious rulers is overthrown by Assyria, and its ten tribes are lost in captivity. The throne of the southern kingdom of Judah is filled with direct descendants of David, the son of Jesse. The true royal line is nearly exterminated by King Jehoram's wife, the ambitious Athaliah, who is Catherine de Medici and Lady Macbeth rolled into one. Daughter of the wicked Jezebel, and grand-daughter of the idolatrous Phœnician King Ethbaal, she attempts the assassination of all her own grandchildren that she may attain the throne.

Little Joash is saved, and the child's coronation is most interesting (II Kings xi). This royal line is very precious; and its tribe, that of Judah, strikes a marked note. From its name, the descendants of Abram, formerly designated as Hebrews, or as Israelites, are now called Jews. Why this prominence? Because from this tribe the promised Messiah is to spring. Hence He is called by the prophets "a Rod out of the stem of Jesse, a Branch out of his roots," the Son of David, and the Lion of the tribe of Judah.

The Kingdom of Judah is finally captive to Babylon, and her poignant sorrow is expressed in the homesick Psalm, number cxxxvii:

> We hanged our harps upon the willows. . . . How shall we sing the Lord's song in a strange land? If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. . . . and let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth, if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy.

There is also a homesick captive lad named Daniel. He is recognized by Nebuchadnezzar as princely and skilful in wisdom; but he is not dazzled by the royal smile. Why does he refuse the king's meat? Because he knows his Deuteronomy, wherein certain kinds of food are permitted or proscribed. His Majesty worships himself, saying, "Is not this great Babylon that I have built by the might of my power?" In contrast, Daniel declares, "I thank Thee, O God, who hast given me wisdom and might." And he courageously rebukes royalty when he interprets the dream of the king and of his impious successor, Belshazzar.

Babylon is overthrown, and Darius, the Mede, takes the kingdom. Daniel is again preferred, and given high station; but no enticing allurements undermine his religion. A malicious decree is issued that, for thirty days, petitions shall be made only to the king. Daniel ignores the royal trap, goes to his chamber, and kneels three times a day in prayer and praise to Jehovah. He opens his window toward Jerusalem. Is he homesick for the house where he was

born? No. For the fields and brooks where he played as a boy? No. He loves Jerusalem as the cradle of his religion, and the place of the Temple. For his disobedience to the king he is thrown to the lions; nevertheless his faith does not quail, nor his life suffer. But the contrite king cries with a lamentable voice (Daniel vi). Retribution comes through Cyrus, king of Persia, who assumes command of the country, and restores the Jews to their land after seventy years' captivity.

And now comes prominently to the front another order in Israel, that of the prophets, for whom the last sixteen books of the Old Testament are named. In the past too many judges have grown corrupt, too many priests have bowed the knee unto Baal, and careless kings have lost the Book of the Law. Who are the prophets? They who teach the vivifying precepts of life. They curb the worldly, declaring that "they earn wages to put it into a bag with holes." They endeavor to quicken the anæmic, who "eat but have not enough, who drink but are not filled, who are clothed but are not warm" (Haggai i, 6). They rebuke the crooked merchant, because wicked balances, deceitful weights and scant measure "are an abomination to the Lord" (Micah vi, 10, 11). They arouse the lethargic; they exhort men to break up the fallow ground of the heart, "to sow in righteousness, and reap in mercy" (Hosea x, 12). They plead in the name of the Lord that men may bring tithes into the storehouse that He may "open the windows of heaven and pour you out a blessing that there shall not be room enough to receive it" (Malachi iii, 10).

We will now revert to the title of this paper, "The Old Testament Mission of the Jews." What mission has Divine Providence put into their hands? They are the scribes of Hebrew Scripture, and contribute much of its coloring. It is a mirror of human nature. Are they the vivifying, and controlling, and formative power back of this writing? Shall we assign to Jehovah or to the Jews the real authorship? I mustn't answer this question to the Literature Class,

because the reply would be Theology. But I may say that I have sat many a Saturday morning in the Northampton Street synagogue, seeing the ancient rolls unfolded, enjoying with the ear but not with the understanding the noble Hebrew tongue, hearing brief sermons in English by Rabbi Schindler, or Rabbi Fleischer. I would gladly have shaken hands with them over the Hebrew Scripture, except that they gave it much less value than I would claim.

In addition to finite human nature, the Divine Nature is also extensively set forth in Scripture, but in highly contradictory aspects. Jehovah averts His face from His children, and is angry with the wicked every day; He revengeth and is furious (Nahum 1, 2); He utters imprecations; He repents that He made man, and He holds him in derision. Surely this is a distorted view of Deity.

In contrast, how can the Infinite God make known to man the divinely human and real aspect of Himself? Only by analogy, leading us from the known to the unknown. There is one subject universally known by the fifteen hundred million people on this planet. What is it? Home life, with its husband, wife, father, mother, children. Hence Jehovah personifies these relationships in addressing His Church. He says: "I will betroth thee to Me in righteousness, in judgment, in loving kindness." After betrothal comes marriage, and He says, "For thy Maker is thy husband." Parenthood follows marriage, and we read, "Like as a father pitieth his children, so the Lord pitieth them that fear Him. A mother may forget her child, yet will I not forget thee. When Israel was a child, then I loved him, I taught Ephraim to walk; I took them on my arms; and I drew them with bands of love."

Could an All-Wise Being give these contradictory views of Himself? Let us have no snap judgment, leaping to conclusions.

We will now turn to the Book of Nature, which was certainly written by God. Here we find a fickle, wandering sun which deserts us every night, leaving us to cold and

darkness, and which veils its face in angry clouds. This is the aspect of nature from the plane of the senses. Rising to the level of reason, we find that the sun's relation to us is without variableness or shadow of turning, and that angry mists emanate from the earth while the sun is flooding all space with friendly radiance. May it be possible that He who writes one book containing both Ptolemaic and Copernican astronomy might write another containing Ptolemaic and Copernican theology?

The Old Testament record closes with the Book of Malachi, 400 B. C. or earlier. During the next two hundred years occurs an event of great importance to mankind. The Scripture is translated into Greek (the Septuagint) at Alexandria, Egypt, by learned Jews. This is admirable, because the Greeks extinguished nationally, are still the intellect of the world. Plato's Academy under the trees merges into the University of Athens which lives a thousand years until the sixth century, A. D. That the Greek language can be bent and turned so as to express foreign Hebrew thought speaks volumes for its flexibility. A New York Jew—Israel Zangwill, or Felix Adler—cleverly describes the difference in brilliant epigram. He speaks of the Greek emphasis put upon proportion, balance, harmony and grace, and says, "The Greeks worshiped the holiness of beauty; but our Scripture bids us emphasize the beauty of holiness (Psalm xxix, 2)."

Does the Old Testament mission of the Jews extend on into the Christian Era? Yes; they are not only the scribes, but the heaven-appointed custodians of their Scripture. They lose their country and their nationality; they are dispersed over the world, are persecuted, and shut up in ghettos by the Christians. But they cling tenaciously to their manuscripts, almost make a fetich of them, and copy them with minute care, even to every jot and tittle. Their racial scholarship makes them linguistically valuable in this field, even after the invention of printing.

Into this Literature Class address I now interpolate a

single sentence, quoting Emanuel Swedenborg's statement, published in the year 1764. He says concerning the Jews: "They are preserved on account of the Word in its original language which they hold as holy more than Christians do." He had said earlier that for this reason they would not be extirpated like other nations.

Back of all this lies the question, How far is the Hebrew Scripture worth preserving? Is it largely obsolete, a dead letter, a milestone left behind in the progress of the race? For answer, let us go back for one last look. We notice that the later Hebrew writers are inclined to spiritualize their text. Regarding sacrifices they declare, "Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of rams or ten thousand rivers of oil? What doth Jehovah require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" We see that offerings are here elevated from the cumbersome rite of animal gifts to the plane of the soul; and every mother who sent sons into the World War knows what sacrifices of the heart mean. The prophet Amos speaks of a need, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of the Lord. The Psalmist gives half a verse on the level of the physical appetite, saying, "As the hart panteth for the water brooks"; and he then rises to the spiritual plane, and continues, "So panteth my soul for Thee, O God."

As I said to the Literature Class earlier, Scripture symbolism involves the relation which an object on a lower plane of existence bears to an object on a higher plane; and the relation is clearly one of function, or use. Physical rock sustains a statehouse or an edifice of worship; and we instinctively say that the consent of the governed is a good corner-stone of a Republic; or that a true idea of God is the chief corner-stone of a Church. Military weapons attack and destroy, and we borrow from them when we speak of a pointed rebuke, a rapier thrust, a keen blow, a sharp condemnation; and we realize that a sword in the hand of St. George or St. Michael is a spiritual weapon against

spiritual dragons or Satans. Truth also pierces a weak spot in sophistical reasoning, as a sword penetrates defective armor. Truth is many-sided; it illumines the mind, as sunshines irradiates our bodily environment; and we very readily say, "This subject is obscure; I am quite in the dark concerning it; I want more light."

Symbolism dates back in actuality to the creation of the material universe. It is God's language, and we weave it unconsciously into our discourse in a fragmentary way. It can never grow old. May Hebrew Scripture possibly be a parable hiding within it the God of love whom the world needs?

Thus ends the talk to the Literature Class. I have given them only crumbs from the Master's table, but I believe that they are verily a part of the Bread of Life, if we assimilate them, so that they become a part of the very fiber of our spiritual being, and strengthen us in better service to the neighbor.

Ednah C. Silver.

STARTED FOR CHRISTIAN CITIZENSHIP.*

By the Rev. Charles W. Harvey.

STARTED for Christian citizenship,—that is what we hope you are, who are leaving our College here today. You are leaving what we try to make a thoroughly and solely Christian school. You are at the "commencement" of what should be a Christian life in a Christian world that it will be your business to make more Christian by your living in it. Christian citizenship is nothing else. It means that you recognize the state you live in as a Christian state and determine to live in it in Christian, that is, neighborly regard and mutual service according to the powers and opportunities granted you by God. And God, as you have learned, we hope, to know and love Him here, is the Christ-God. He is the Lord, glorified with the glory which He had with His Fatherhood before the world was. He is the Christ whom we know of in the flesh on earth, grown up into that full and sole divinity which He showed He had attained when, after His resurrection, He said, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and on earth." It is the Christ-God then, who as the Word "was life, and His life the light of men," who tells you today—who would remind us all at each day or stage of our life—that He expects this life of ours to be the Christian life that He, in His Christhood on earth, showed us how to live.

You will meet—we all meet—many in other educational institutions to which you may be going, or in the harder school of experience, who think quite otherwise of the nature of life. Let us take this little time of reasoning

* Commencement Address at Urbana University, June, 1923.

together then, to arm ourselves against these false views of life which rob it of so much of its possible blessings. Let us take the time to remind ourselves of those views of the nature of life which the Church teaches us so helpfully, of which your Doctrine Courses here have given you the general principles.

The Scripture is quite definite as to the Source and purpose of life: "Thou"—the Lord—"hast created all things, and for thy pleasure (or will) they are and were created." Naturalism and worldliness deny this. They say that we are probably a mere outgrowth from Nature, by her own self-acting laws. The idea is absurd on the face of it. Everything about us, our own lives in particular, prove that there is some purpose running through it all. Now, purpose, or design, still more the understanding of how to carry out a purpose and adapt it to the varying conditions of human affairs, cannot possibly be a faculty of mere matter. Nature is indeed the evidence of infinite design, infinite law and order; but the law, order and design of an Infinite Personal Being. No reasonable man can believe that Nature is her own originator.

Older Christianity taught us of our Divine Author, but so that it was almost impossible to understand Him. It insisted that we ourselves and everything came out of nothing, by the mere "say-so" of God. The Church long stood out against accepting any form of the scientific doctrine of evolution. To think of God working by orderly process, such as we find in Nature, was supposed to limit His Omnipotence. God, as King over all the earth, had to be thought of as doing just as He pleased, infinitely above all the laws which bound creation. The Church for today knows better. She reminds us that this universe could not be so perfectly ordered, were not the Lord order itself. (True Christian Religion, n. 51.) The laws of all creation are His laws, to which, therefore, He could not be false. One of His laws of creating may very possibly be that which Science thinks it has discovered in evolution;

namely, the gradual improving of species and building new species, one out of or upon another. This, at least, seems a more conceivable beginning for our race than the poetic hypothesis suggested in Swedenborg's pre-illumination work, "The Worship and Love of God." In the Church view of evolution, however, its improvements cannot be thought of as coming out of the nature of the finite thing itself. They must always be induced upon it, when needed, by the First Cause of all things, the one, only Being who can make any real addition to any form of existence. Even the miracles of God our Christianity of today defines more conservatively,—as a Divine operation indeed, but never against His own laws, rather by means of some law as yet unknown to us.

We can follow the older Church teaching so far as to say that God's Word could make all things; but not out of nothing; rather out of the very substance of His own Being. Even our words can do something similar. Is it not true that thoughts, ideas, and their expression in words, are the real creators of all we make for ourselves in life? Did not the idea of war create the World War? Are we not hoping and praying that intelligent thought and planning for peace, will create world peace? If our word, the expression of our human idea, can create so much, what may we not suppose the Divine Word might do! But to make our ideas materially effective—for example, the idea of a chair or table—requires the factor of material substance. This, truly, we cannot create by our own word or thought alone. But the Lord, we are taught, is Himself the essential substance of all things. (True Christian Religion, n. 20.) That substance of Himself, therefore, would be always ready to infill each and every form of His Divine self-expression.

With this familiar thought of the Church in mind as to the Divine Source of all substance, we should be able to take our Gospel literally, and work out a practical, helpful, idea of life, right from that Source into all forms of

life around us. The main element in the Nature of God, His Divine Love, is of such a character that it must come outside of itself (*ibid.*, n. 43). Its urgency is to make other beings, capable of receiving and returning His Divine Love and all its wondrous blessings. The "Word," in St. John's Gospel, stands also for the Wisdom of God. That is the other complementary element of the Divine Being. This Divine Love and Divine Wisdom are not, indeed, material substance. But they are spiritually substantial forces. The Love or purpose originates; the Wisdom creates.

Now this wonderful duplex Divine force of life, we are taught, changes its character in the course of its progress further and further forth from God. It becomes more and more quiescent, more and more fixed, as it proceeds. Nearest the very Being of God, it is, we are taught, the first encompassing sphere, which appears before the spiritual eyes of "the blessed" as their actual Sun, the "Sun of Righteousness." Further progressing, changing of quality and quiescence, produce successively the atmospheres of the heavenly world, the substance of the souls who live there, and lastly the substance of their spiritual environment, down to the very least thing they find about them for the stimulation of their heavenly lives. A further progression still, forms that purest material substance, or energy, which constitutes the suns of the different solar systems. Then from the various suns come the earths of each solar system, according to the nebular theory, which, as your Science courses have doubtless reminded you, Swedenborg in his scientific days discovered, before the great Frenchman, LaPlace. Thus are formed by steps one from another, each more quiescent than the last, the atmospheres of the various earths of the Universe, and at last material substances of the mineral, the vegetable, and the animal kingdoms; the mineral the most fixed of all.

But how, we say, can anything so physical as the earth beneath our feet, be formed, even indirectly, from anything

so impalpable as this very Love and Wisdom of God? Science has many illustrations. Perhaps the simplest is one you know well from your elementary chemistry. The two impalpable gases, oxygen and hydrogen, combined just right, of themselves produce an entirely new substance, water. But the water has qualities wholly different from those of either of the two gases from which alone it is formed. The gases are, as we may say, of a directly higher degree of materiality. But there are many more recent, popular illustrations of the principle, e.g., in physiology. This has recently proved that the evil force of anger, wholly of course of the spirit, of itself apparently creates a poisonous toxin in the body, able to be taken out of the body, and experimented with by ordinary chemical reagents.

If we can truly believe this teaching which the Church builds right on the Gospel, that life comes originally and all the time from the very Being of the Heavenly all-Father and Savior Himself, it should give us a new, inspiring attitude both to life and to its Source. Our creation is not the mechanical thing which Science, two or three generations ago, tried to make it. Through our parents today, just as through our first parents, whoever or whatever they may have been, the Lord creates each one of us when He needs us in the great universe of all His children; in that one of His worlds in which He needs us most; in that environment of nature; in that nation, in that very family in which all the circumstances will be the best to make us what He would have us be, what we shall find our highest joy in becoming.

This teaching is confirmed by all the forms of life we find about us. See how Nature is all made for use; each thing to itself, to the things and beings next around it, to those next above it in the scale of creation, and these, step above step, to ourselves, the human beings whom it is all designed to make the very children of God. The earths grow the different foods. The minerals enter into all the

physical structure of life, its comfort, ornamentation, and transportation, to say nothing of that which is the greatest facilitator of it all, our money. The vegetable world also yields food and medicine and much of our habitations. And again the animal world adds its blessings of food and clothing. The same wonderful environment serves for our mental blessing. It stimulates us to compare, classify and make our sciences out of all these natural phenomena; to recombine their discovered forces at our pleasure, and harness them for further benefits, of use and beauty. And see what all these marvels of nature do for our more directly spiritual growth! To get the best results from any of the forces of nature, e.g., electricity, is impossible for any individual working alone. It needs combinations, of capital, of people, in cities. Hence we grow in understanding of our own and others' human nature; in patience; in complementary service one of another, each according to our special God-given powers; in that wonderful sense of inter-dependence which fulfils the revealed object of it all,—love of our neighbor, the ultimate expression of our love and gratitude for it all to God. Hence the familiar teaching of the Church, that the final object of creation is *ourselves*; that is, the use we can make of all life about us for our mutual perfecting, in body, mind, and soul; and that is the will and pleasure of Him who made it.

Now let us discuss briefly some of the difficulties of this general idea of the beneficence of our life from God.

Why do we find so many things in life to our apparent disadvantage,—evil creatures of all sorts, even death-dealing poisons of taste, touch and odor? Is it part of the punishment God puts upon us as the heritage of sinning Adam? No evil happening is ever a mere punishment; least of all God's. It is always a consequence upon some ignorant or deliberate wrong-doing which He allows only when it may teach us to do better.

Let us try to picture the course of evil in the world. We are taught in the Divine allegory of the loss of Eden,

that evil first came by man's listening to the temptations of his lower nature, symbolized by the serpent. These were temptations to live for our own will and pleasure, instead of the true pleasure of God's will. This evil desire soon had its obvious correspondent, the tempting, venomous, earth-clinging serpent. We may think perhaps of this serpent embodiment of self-will and pleasure as at first evanescent. It would be likely as much a mere projection of the human nature it horribly illustrated, and should have helped correct, as are to be the creatures of our future life, heavenly or the reverse as we are making it. But the same evil, and other kindred ones, persisted in human life. They would presently, then, form persisting evil organisms, material and reproductive; just as we know some of the toxins of the body become fixed there, from persistence in evil practices. These actual, noxious species, then, would be permitted by the Lord's providence to represent thus tangibly the poisonous nature of the inner state of evil which they pictured. Failing, however, to warn or frighten mankind into desistence, they still continue and propagate, with such gradual variations, doubtless, as reflect the gradually changing inner state of human life. And now that their immediate spiritual significance is so little recognized, their permission under Providence serves other, negative uses. They teach patient, scientific research, to deal with them on the material plane. They serve besides such uses as medicine discovers for them. The Homeopathic School uses poisons to carry off the like poisons developed in the human system, which the Allopathic Schools use directly; for example, a certain snake-venom is said to be the only known cure for some forms of insanity. And then all these noxious creations and their almost wholly negative material values—setting "rogue to catch rogue," as we may say, to clear away disease—are allowed, besides, for their spiritual reminder, to those who will recognize it; that if only we would "cease to do evil" —such evils as these things picture—their embodiments

surely would die out, and the Lord's creation continue as it began, only "good," "very good."

The case is the same with the fight of species against species, one preying upon another. Some say this fight is the real, basic structure of all nature. It is one of the commonest arguments against the possibility of any beneficent Creator at all.

Nature is no more all a strife than is human life, of which such battles as *are* in nature are but the mirror. But being so, they are the Lord's reminder of the waste of all mere strife; they are the Lord's voice, through His works, saying in effect one word: Desist. You know better than these unreasoning brutes. Get your growth in courage and conquest less bloodily, by the necessary struggle which I provide for, with material things and forces, and in all forms of generous emulation in bodily and mental sport. These will stimulate you indeed to mastery; but only for use, the proper and proportioned use of each thing mastered. We cannot, surely, conceive of the animals as God created them and called them good, always fighting and preying one upon another. Does that not mean, then, that when we will cease preying upon one another, that we shall be forced no longer to look upon our picture in the bloodthirsty brutality of Nature? Will not Providence show us other ways in which creatures can be fed, than with one another? Is it not of "that day" that He says, "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, ... the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them."

Another phenomenon which many point to bitterly, as something a beneficent Creator would never permit, is the suffering of animals. This is not an easy subject. But we must at least allow for the fact that we have no idea just how much they do suffer. Impossible as it is for any one of us truly to estimate the sufferings of any fellow-man,—conditioned as this is by the individual attitude of the sufferer within, not by what appears to others from

outside,—still less is it possible to know what goes on behind the animal's actual sensations and reflexes. We must allow again for the fact that with animals there is no anticipation, the worst feature of human suffering. Allowing for these things in what we must see of animal sufferings, is not what remains but an urging by the Lord to us to take extra care of our treatment of all dumb creatures; and by our care for them to learn more kindness toward one another? Is not all animal suffering the Divine reminder of the elemental need to conquer—to get utterly rid of—our native cruelty; to train our children, still more ourselves, against this most mean and disgraceful quality, doubtless a survival of our own animal inheritance? And is not animal suffering besides, to all who will see from the spirit, an object lesson in the complete coherence of all the works of God and their one, human end? Does it not mean that, when we as a race shall rid ourselves of this cruelty, He will remove the reminder, which He can give us now in no gentler way? Meanwhile, can we not trust Him, in this as in all evils, to "temper the wind to the shorn lamb"? We can trust the Lord that He is ever mitigating the actual condition of each and every animal case that is serving as our example and reminder not to cause any unnecessary suffering to one another. We can trust the Lord to be ever mitigating, as far as ever possible, consistent with the end, the service of Nature and of Man. He mitigates the animal's suffering by its lack of anticipation, its lack of self-consciousness, and many other attendant conditions, of which we can judge necessarily only most superficially. The more we study nature and her divinely given laws, the surer we become that it all hangs together, and, at last, on our one blessed Divine First Cause of all. It has all some place in the one beneficent purpose which He is working out, for us, the culmination of it all; namely, our continually greater blessing in life, just as rapidly as the preservation and growth of our properly human qualities of freedom and reason can allow.

This, then, is something of the life which you are commencing today. Get clearly in mind its Source and purpose. Let no contrary drift of worldly or supposedly learned opinion shake the one reasonable, foundation-stone truth. Life is from the one Divinely Human God, the Christ "glorified with the glory which He had with His Divine Fatherhood before the world was." In His image and likeness we are all made. His image and likeness we are meant, each in our own best way, to become. The purpose of life is His purpose,—to bless each of us to our fullest capacity, and all of us together, so far as we will work together for the best for us all. And this blessing of us He can effect only through the powers or talents He has given us—each of us differently according to our capacity—through the opportunities of parentage, education, and circumstance He provides or allows. The abundance of His blessing is conditioned absolutely by the extent of the use we will make of it all.

Do not let all this great heritage of life, from God, from the most distant as well as from the most immediate past, of which all your science and history remind you, find its latest expression in you or any of us in vain. Let us study not only our books and our companions and the conditions of things we find ourselves born into, essential as all these studies are. Let us study also into ourselves, to find the good powers in us that give us the greatest satisfaction in exercise. Nip in the bud, in the first intention, any inclination to self-indulgence that would waste our powers or interfere with their fullest possible growth by exercise. There is always room in the world, and "favor with God and man," for the one who makes life better for himself and others; no room and no favor for him who wastes and spoils life for himself, for that always wastes and spoils it just so much for everyone around him.

Each one our own use; our own most intelligent, most growing use; in more study in higher branches; in simple home duties; in teaching, or preaching to others; in beau-

tifying their lives through any of the arts; in ministering to our fellows' health, bodily, mental and spiritual all together, as any true Christian physician of today must; as head-worker or hand-worker in any business,—let us remember it is the Lord's business, the Lord's science and art, the Lord's most blessed kingdom of home, the Lord's whole kingdom of life so far as it is worth while. Do each your part to make your corner of it more fully His, by discovering more and more of His blessed life-forces, through the Church's leadership, in His Word, His works of nature, and in all the wonderful works with us of His daily and age-long providences. Learn, make your own, each in your own best way, these life-forces of the Lord that run through every form of life around you. So help to make any state of the world in which you may find yourselves, more Christian in its citizenship; that is, more neighborly, under the one Divine Example, who is also the one blessed Prototype of us and all things. So help to make it truer every day that "all the Kingdoms of the world *are become* the Kingdom of our Lord and of His Christ,"—the Kingdom of our One, ever blessed and glorious Christ-God.

CHARLES W. HARVEY.

"THE MIND IN THE MAKING"

By the Rev. Lewis F. Hite

"The Mind in the Making,"* by James Harvey Robinson, is a fair sample of modernistic reflection upon the past, glorification of the present, and prediction for the future. No doubt it is a glorious thing to live in the modern world; but there were glories of Greece and Rome ("The glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome"); there were glories of mediæval architecture, of mediæval religion and philosophy; but the modernists usually know only the glories of the Renaissance, the Reformation, and especially the glories of "The Scientific Awakening and Discovery." They are ready to discredit the past by reciting the achievements of Galileo, Newton, and Bacon; sometimes they recall Copernicus, Kepler, and Descartes. They inevitably neglect the dependence of these men upon the past, upon Aristotelianism in particular, just as they neglect the course of history in general. They are blinded by the light of their own day.

It is, of course, irrelevant, not to say preposterous, to decry the wonders of modern inventions and the progress of modern science; but it is entirely pertinent to question the supremacy of modernism in human intelligence, in morality, and in religion. The present is too full of unsolved problems, too beset with adverse human conditions, to permit reckless exultation.

Mr. Robinson, the author of this book, is a modernistic writer of pronounced type; he is fluent, positive, and

---

* *The Mind in the Making;* the Relation of Intelligence to Social Reform. By James Harvey Robinson. New York: Harper and Brothers. 1921. 235 pp., 8vo. Cloth. $2.50.

sweeping. The book is interesting in its platitudes, and inviting in its promises; but as usual the promises are not fulfilled. The author undertakes to maintain and urge the thesis, that if men would disabuse themselves of their present ways of looking at life, and would take the scientific attitude and view, the difficulties and problems of the world would disappear like the mist before the morning sun. In his own words:

> If some magical transformation could be produced in men's ways of looking at themselves and their fellows, no inconsiderable part of the evils which now afflict society would vanish away or remedy themselves automatically. If the majority of influential persons held the opinions and occupied the point of view that a few rather uninfluential people now do, there would, for instance, be no likelihood of another great war; the whole problem of "labor and capital" would be transformed and attenuated; national arrogance, race animosity, political corruption. and inefficiency would all be reduced below the danger point. (P. 3.)

We need go no further in forming an estimate of the book than to examine the presuppositions and the implications of this paragraph; for the whole is merely an expansion of the ideas here presented. The opinions and the point of view which would accomplish the "magical transformation" are brought forward later, and they will be found to be the commonplaces of modernistic assertion.

The scope and character of the author's treatment are sufficiently indicated by the following headings of chapters: Three Disappointed Methods of Reform; On Various Kinds of Thinking; How Creative Thought Transforms the World; Our Animal Heritage; Our Savage Mind; Our Mediæval Intellectual Inheritance; The Scientific Revolution. Obviously, the course of thought here is evolutionistic; and in fact the book is hardly more than evolutionistic gossip rather fluently and interestingly presented. Within the body of its evolutionistic procedure, the dominant idea is Creative Thought; for it is the function of Creative Thought that is relied upon to transform the world. All other functions and methods are discredited

by disposing of the historical elements under the head of "Three Disappointed Methods of Reform," and by marking the contrast between other kinds of thinking and "Creative Thought." Herewith we have the course of the argument; and to appreciate the special merits of the book this should be followed in some detail.

The first of the "three disappointed methods of reform" is characterized as *"changes in the rules of the game"*; in other words, reorganization and legislation. Here it is pointed out that "what we usually need is a change of attitude, and without this our new regulations often leave the old situation unaltered." Impatient of mere administrative reform, and lacking faith in it, we turn next to *"spiritual exhortation,"* and urge the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. The doctrine has been preached for more than eighteen centuries, and under it slavery, serfdom, wars, and industrial oppression, have flourished. As Mr. Robinson says:

> We still worship a tribal God, and the "foe" is not to be reckoned among his children. Suspicion and hate are much more congenial to our natures than love, for very obvious reasons in this world of rivalry and common failure. There is, beyond doubt, a natural kindliness in mankind which will show itself under favorable auspices. But experience would seem to teach that it is little promoted by moral exhortation. (P. 17.)

In view of these disappointing agencies, it is then urged that "what we need above all is *education.*" But when we consider the aims and results of education, past and present, disappointment and dissatisfaction are more oppressive than ever. Such education does not develop a real love for the things about which it is concerned: for the old and best books, for the ancient and modern languages, for history, for science, for philosophy, for "the beasts, birds, plants, and rocks," nor for men; it does not even develop real curiosity about these things. "The arts of reading, writing, and figuring" are supposed to be a preparation for living in "a world of newspapers and business"; technical schools

prepare for earning a livelihood; other studies promote "general culture," and serve for "training the mind." But these aims are personal,—"*personal* worldly success" and "*personal* culture and intellectual and literary enjoyment." More recently "education for citizenship" has come into vogue. But here too the education is concerned more with the past than with the present and the future. Political and social questions, on the other hand, "prevailing business methods, race animosities, public elections, and governmental policy," are matters of present and future concern; and what is more, they are highly and sensitively "controversial." Teachers and preachers must be cautious how they enter upon these domains, and must confine themselves to the commonplaces of history and morality, under the penalty of loss of position and means of subsistence. "Education for citizenship," then, amounts in substance and effect to little more than a recital of the gossip of the ages. In this line George Bernard Shaw is quoted:

> Our schools teach the morality of feudalism corrupted by commercialism, and hold up the military conqueror, the robber baron, and the profiteer, as models of the illustrious and successful.

We may sympathize to a certain extent and in certain particulars with this indictment; but we must recognize that it is hostile, narrow-minded and partisan criticism, and negative criticism at that. It will not do to say that present day education does not fit us to play a better part in social and political life,—such an assertion would be preposterous; nor does it help much to qualify the assertion, as the author does, by putting it in the form, the purpose is "not primarily to fit us to play a part in the social or political betterment." The question is, What difference does it make to add "primarily" and to insert the word "betterment"; and especially how could this new purpose be stated in definite terms and put into concrete operation? The answer calls for a contrast between the present system of education, and some more direct and effective agency. What is the agency?

If re-organization, moral exhortation, and education

have shown themselves to be inadequate, what other agency may we look to? The answer is, "Intelligence." It is rather startling to be told that the world has been doing without intelligence up to now, and that this "is as yet an untested hope in its application to the regulation of human relations." Here the author's secret is revealed. He maintains that intelligence "has not been tried on any large scale outside the realm of natural science." Here "it has produced marvelous results," and "has completely revolutionized men's notions about the world in which they live, and of its inhabitants, *with the notable exception of man himself.*" How has this revolution come about? The answer is: "It was necessary to discard practically all the consecrated notions of the world and its workings which had been held by the best and wisest and purest of mankind down to three hundred years ago—indeed until much more recently." In short, it has been necessary to "break valiantly with the past in order to get ahead." As examples of this turning one's back upon the past, the author cites, as usual, Bacon, Galileo, and Descartes. If he had cited Bacon and Descartes as typical cases of self-deluded Aristotelians, he would have shown more familiarity with history. The author's characteristic contention is that, under the present conditions intelligence is not free, that it is bound by the traditions of the past and by the conservative interests of the present; and his sole proposal is to free intelligence. "I have no reforms to recommend, except the liberation of Intelligence, which is the first and most essential one." The rest of the book is devoted to an evolutionistic account of the nature and development of intelligence, "the main theme of the book, a sketch of the manner in which our human intelligence appears to have come about."

This task is pursued under the general headings of Our Animal Heritage, Our Savage Mind, On the Various Kinds of Thinking; then follow some chapters on Mediæval Civilization, and Scientific Knowledge; and finally some general, but interesting, criticisms of An Acquisitive So-

ciety, The Philosophy of Safety and Sanity, and The Philosophy of Repression.

The core of the book lies naturally in the account of intelligence. The first thing to do, as a matter of course, is to turn our backs on the philosophers of the past. We may look to the poets and to recent story-writers for the truest and most profound observations on the nature of intelligence; but most philosophers "have exhibited a grotesque ignorance of man's life." "They have almost consistently neglected the actual process of thought, and have set off the mind as something apart, to be studied by itself" —for example, such philosophers as Plato, Plotinus, Thomas Aquinas, Descartes, Leibniz, Berkeley, Hume, not to speak of Royce, James, Bergson, Russell and others!!! "But no such mind, exempt from bodily processes, animal impulses, savage traditions, infantile impressions, conventional re-actions, and traditional knowledge, ever existed." As a matter of fact, the problem of the relation of mind and body has been a constant one since the days of Empedocles and Anaxagoras, more definitely from the days of Plato and Aristotle; and this problem involves making a distinction, as well as observing the connection. Even Descartes, with his fundamental dualism, by no means undertook to study the mind apart from the psychophysics involved. Here again the author is merely being true to type as a modernist.

Having thus disposed of the past, we clear the way for progress by noting some of the "new ideas which have been emerging during the past few years in regard to our minds and their operations."

> If we are ever to understand man, his conduct and reasoning, if we aspire to learn to guide his life and his relations with his fellows more happily than heretofore, we cannot neglect the great discoveries to begin with, of the concrete mind, and the "Unconscious."

The author proceeds to emphasize, as a new motive, the importance of studying the mind in the concrete, and to

signalize, as a recent discovery, the notion of the "Unconscious." It would be interesting to dwell on the meaning which is given to the term "unconscious" in modern psychology; but the author affords little inkling of this meaning, and he seems to be unaware that it is a contradiction in terms to speak of unconscious mental states. However, any one who is familiar with the historical studies of *memory* would never suspect that either the term or the field of the unconscious is a recent discovery.

The kinds of thinking dealt with are: reverie, practical thinking, and rationalizing. The author has some interesting and significant things to say about what goes on in the mind in states of reverie; but what he says about rationalizing is more than surprising. No doubt rationalizing is much concerned with reveries, with opinions and beliefs; but it is also concerned with such things as the theory of numbers, the postulates and methods of geometry, with logical system, with the facts of plant and animal life, with the complex web of social and political conditions. To restrict it and say, as the author does, "Rationalizing is the self-exculpation which occurs when we feel ourselves, or our group, accused of misapprehension or error," is suggestive of auto-hypnotism. Self-justification has a wide and obscure range of activity; but we would hardly speak of the rationalizing of the scientific mind as self-justification. From this self-centered rationalizing, we are asked to distinguish another type of thinking, the type of Creative Thought.

When we yield to curiosity, "idle curiosity," and try to get more knowledge of something, we forget self for the moment, and pursue a disinterested inquiry into the nature and relations of the object of attention. This easily and naturally develops the scientific habit of systematic investigation and research. In this kind of activity, new knowledge is acquired and new relations discovered; new systems of knowledge are built up. This is what the author calls

Creative Thought. The whole body of modern science is the outcome.

It is to this kind of thought that the author looks for the "magical transformation" which would solve our problems and cure our ills. All that he asks of us is, to forget our animal heritage, our savage minds, our mediæval inheritance, and yield ourselves to the magic of modern science. This is the change of attitude required. Suppose the change made, suppose the scientific view adopted, and the methods and wealth of modern science acquired, what new, definite, concrete steps are proposed? Here the author leaves us to our own resources, and like the ordinary generalizing and "rationalizing" critics of the past, and reformers of the present, is content with empty prediction.

Nevertheless, the book is readable, and for many no doubt would be helpful and stimulating. We have meant to suggest that it should be read with due caution.

Lewis F. Hite.

EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT

THE REVIEW

AND SOME NOTES ON THE PROSPECT

THE continued existence of THE REVIEW seems assured for some time ahead. New and returning subscribers and the gifts of a number of friends guarantee it. Those in charge of the quarterly are gratified, of course, and grateful. As the new subscriptions, and the renewal of old ones, and the contributions of money mean an interest on the part of the Church in keeping alive in our body this means for the exchange of more serious thought, we think that the gratification at the continued existence of the paper must extend to a good circle of friends.

We also feel that our contributors of articles must have as keen a satisfaction as any one in the uninterrupted publication of THE REVIEW. Had the paper lapsed, it would have meant on the part of the Church at large a regrettable lack of desire for a paper like THE REVIEW. It would have been a great disappointment to those who are trying to make the magazine more and more useful. But to those who are studying the message and the work of the Church, and who feel they have something to say on either head, the lapse of the paper should have argued something distinctly hampering, as they lost an influential means of presenting for estimate and use the conclusions of their studies.

It should have been a prime argument for the continued life of THE REVIEW that there are things to be said, which THE REVIEW is needed for saying. The unprotested and unfelt disappearance of the paper from among our periodicals would have meant that there was nothing needing very much to be said, nor any one having much to say, nor any one wanting much said, at such length and in the studied form which the quarterly alone allows for.

The paper pre-supposes a body of active students among us; and it is true at least that we have not the body of students we once had. Our study is focussed on, or by, the Theological Works; and it is true again that study of them, carried on within the covers of the books, and seeking to master what is there and from an "inside" point of view, has fallen off. There is not the study now that there has been to bring together and to state what Swedenborg teaches; no one can doubt it whose memory runs back, or whose acquaintance with our periodical literature takes him back, any length of time. Still, this may be true, and yet studious effort of all kinds may not have disappeared. In fact, another order of work may have begun coming in, which will seek to record itself and to be heard in such a paper as THE REVIEW. We may be low in productive study, not only because in the shortage of workers generally the body of close students has also been cut down, but in addition because we are at a point of transition, when study is ceasing to be one thing and trying to become another. Reproductive study, to characterize it very generally, may be in the way to being followed by what is primarily interpretative, to characterize that very generally. To set out what is in the Theological Works is a first piece of work. Early periodicals were in large part selections from the Theological Works. The mass both of them and of collateral literature generally attests the devotion to the work of publication which the Church has displayed. Once you take "the New Church point of view," or only throw it into contrast with others, there is a surprisingly large amount of work done in that point of view and appealing to it. But there follows a second effort inevitably. What has been laid hold on in the Theological Works can be grasped in the setting of other related thought; especially it can be re-addressed to current interest, and inserted in contemporary discussion; and it is a question whether we are not now trying to get our direction for doing this as we have never managed to do it so far. Adjustment comes slowly, as, slowly, we get the whole task in sight, and as, slowly, we get the preparation required for it in our workers. We hope that

there is a period of such fresh, interpretative study ahead, to which we should like to see THE REVIEW a stimulus, and of which we should like to see it a welcome spokesman. There will be a wealth of things to say as we manage to occupy the outlook into which, due to circumstances, and the exigencies of our work, and convictions about our needs, we seem to be coming. Far more to the interpretative mind than to the proclamatory mind does the multitude of sides to our message as a Church come home. The ever increasing pertinency of the message and its fresh aspect for a changing day comes home to the man who is studying, too, the world he is addressing. Study of the Theological Works for the positions they take, will not, we shall find, have uncovered the power and riches of those teachings as will the study, in addition, of positions to which those works lead. There are bodies of suggestive material in the books which will take extended and useful elaboration; and some suggested points have more pertinency and value now than others which the Revelator himself may have taken to the point of elaboration in following up his mission. In other words, it is a growing body of teaching we have in these works, and not a fixed set of tenets; and a new order of study will make the most of the fact. And attentive as interpretative study, to call it so, will be to the effectiveness and pertinency with which we may say what we have to say, thought will fall more than it has on how our work is done. As a church body, whose affairs are managed after the highest prudence and best foresight and leadership which we can command, we have many questions really of administration and policy and of address to the world to consider, which we need to think through with spirit and in a readiness to follow new paths. Study of this and the other character THE REVIEW would like to serve to present, and also to encourage, if simply by being at hand for the record and publication of it.

THE REVIEW is by nature a journal of opinion, and of opinion on two kinds of matters. It has sought and published discussions and expositions of the message of the Church, as this is to be found in the Word and in the Theological Works.

But besides concerning itself with the message of the Church, it has sought and published discussions of the work of the Church. Opinion, spirited and thoughtful, is wanted as much on the policy of our body as on what it teaches, and on the opportunities we have for doing our work, and on the obstacles in the way to doing it which we have to meet, and on the bearing on us, and on our methods of approach, of any issues in the religious world generally or tendencies of thought. THE REVIEW has aimed to be a journal of opinion not only on studious subjects but on our active affairs as a Church.

These latter matters have not had the discussion which certainly they invite.

Our readers surely would be interested to have the work of the Board of Missions, for example, discussed broadly in our quarterly. Here is our liveliest corporate piece of work. Time was when the Board met to ask if there was anything to attend to, heard there was not, and adjourned. Now it cannot follow up, as it would like, the opportunities before it. The bare facts about our missionary activities and the various single efforts which the Board is making, the annual reports tell us about at Convention, and we hear of them from time to time in *The Messenger*; but there are larger possible discussions of the work which could be given the ample space they need in THE REVIEW. A general survey of the possibilities before the Board would be interesting. A consideration of the policies pursued in the work would be no less so. In the work being done there must be some plan, more or less fully formulated, and behind it some survey of the opportunities in missions. What is the plan, and what is the survey? Collateral questions spring up. The growth and liveliness of the interest in foreign fields has been the source of new energy, we believe, to the Church at home. It has meant a large proportion of foreign students at the Theological School, in whose training the Board has co-operated. But there have come strains on us at two points. How will these be met? One strain on us is to furnish the intending missionary with an apt equipment for his field abroad. While there are courses at

the School to give the missionary his staple material as a New-Church minister, and while we practise certain adaptations naturally to the man and the field in training the individual student, there are no such courses in missions subjects as other seminaries offer. A student at a Baptist seminary, attracted to our own teaching, and meaning to go into missions, recently wrote, asking what the School had to offer in the way of courses on missions. The answer had to be "nothing formal." Should we be looking forward to the organization of some courses which shall be a modest beginning in this department? What would the Board, drawing on the experiences of its missionaries, propose for such courses? The other strain falls on the financial resources of the Church at home, and its missionary enthusiasm and strength in general. The fields abroad grow more numerous, and each of them spreads so fast that the needs there, like the opportunities, are coming to be a good deal to provide for from so small a home-base. There must be strengthening at home to do the cause justice abroad. Both these strains on the Church at home call for plans. And there are other matters of policy involved in the work. It has been a deep gratification to have men offer themselves from the fields which called for workers. It would have been a hopeless effort to have gone and combed the fields for possible native missionaries. They freely appeared. And these men, for the most part, have taken their own way in cultivating the interest among their people. It is the custom in Protestant bodies to set a supervisor from the home church over native missionaries. After a fashion our Board did this in the Philippine Islands, but not as a formulated policy; and it has not done it elsewhere, as in the Japanese missions. Is it the thing to do? Or would it mean clinging too much to our own way of doing, which may not be what suits the genius and spiritual need of another people? National and racial variation on the spiritual life which the Lord will bring us in His Second Coming is part, is it not, of the catholicity of the New Church; in settling in each field the native missionaries that offer, subject only to the supervision of the Board at home, do we not

ensure the freest and most characteristic development of the Church there?

The Review is eager to serve for the discussion of these and other questions on Missions, and to help towards even greater interest in our missionary work. We look forward to offering our readers in an early issue some expression from the Secretary of the Board on the outlook, plans and policy of the Board. Another article from the President of Convention may reflect something of his recent visit to the Philippine Islands, where interest in the Church was a quick conflagration as a number of isolated fires in different parts of the Islands swept together. Unfortunately, as it seems now, Mr. Worcester will have to forego his visit to Japan and the mission at Tokio, because of the fearful disaster that overtook that empire.

There are always issues and questions before all men and women who take the Christian name on themselves toward which the Church needs to have well considered and informed attitudes and opinions. There is the current "mental" division between "liberal" and "fundamentalist" in so many denominations. Off-hand one might think that the stout assertion by the "fundamentalists" of the plenary inspiration of the Bible, and of the Deity of Jesus Christ, and other positions, would mean that our own sympathies, if they are to be exerted at all, should be exerted, if possible, in their direction. And off-hand, equally well, it might seem as though the "liberals," with their spirit of inquiry into the meaning of the Christian faith, their desire to grasp the message of God in the Bible, and to know God in Christ, should have the helping hand, or the moral support, of every forward-looking Christian. The appreciation of what these movements really amount to, however, will come from something more than off-hand inference from catch-words. Perhaps to a point of view outside there is no real issue, or the issue does not amount to as much as it seems to do to those concerned, or as the things do which the parties have in common. Or, perhaps, there is a really terrific issue here—and the "fundamentalist" is the re-action to

the good "old church," and the "liberal" the effort to struggle into the new light that is breaking with the day of the Lord's Return, and into the profounder Christian life He brings. If that is the battle, we ought to know it, and we are a peculiarly futile people if we go on to have nothing to do with it.

The exertion of sympathy in this significant issue between camps in the denominations could conceivably find an avenue for expression if our body was a member of federations of Christian churches—as it is in some places. The propriety and the usefulness of such affiliation for us is another pretty vital question on which THE REVIEW would like to serve its readers well. It is no academic query at all. What the Theological Works have to say of the Christian world of the eighteenth century will have to be reckoned with as a light to be thrown forward on conditions as we can observe them now. But for the most part we shall have to form, in this light, the wisest judgment we are capable of; it may be our extinction to join the stream of federation and be merged out of all character and washed clean of any peculiar mission, or it may be the introduction of a leaven which will have a loaf then in which to work.

Or take a specific question now very much to the front in religious and general discussion,—that of divorce, or of the divorce evil. *The Atlantic Monthly* has begun a series of discussions on divorce. Dr. J. Fort Newton contributed the first article, in June, under the title, "What God Hath Not Joined." Miss Maude Royden followed with one in September on "What is Marriage? The Problem of Divorce"; and the publishers announce a third discussion in October from Mrs. Gerould. *The Homiletic Review* ran excellent studies on the subject in its June number. Our REVIEW (July, 1923) published an essay on the subject by Mr. Asa E. Goddard. Discussion of divorce begins to go different ways at what seems the crux of the matter for Christian discussion, namely, the Lord's own words on the subject. Mr. Goddard, it is true, said (p. 305) that "the precepts of the Lord are definite and clear," and made the Lord out to have legislated on the subject, and

to have laid down the one cause on which a civil court in a Christian land could rightly grant a divorce. But there is the previous question: Was the Lord announcing an ideal, and giving utterance to a principle of religion, or dropping into the sphere of legal science and laying down a rule? Here discussion has inveterately gone different ways. Dr. Newton, for instance, does not hope to work with this particular Scripture effectually, employing Christian principles of less restricted application, and referring to the Scripture oftenest relied on by the Church in its conventional position, as "an ancient formula of doubtful exegesis" (p. 722). We have had discussion at large in our pages in the past on the subject of divorce, but none, in our recollection, which dealt first and necessarily first with the question, *how* take the Lord's words on marriage and divorce? As those Scripture words are resorted to in "Conjugial Love," they are handled there, too, as a piece of legislation, or as an utterance of a principle, which may very well be provided for only in a *mass* of legislation; and "Conjugial Love" itself is either legislating or uttering a principle of Christianity. Should we not think through our attitude on this great subject and urgent issue, from the matter of exegesis up? Whatever we may have thought through now, in our own estimation, is at least nothing but the re-iteration of the conventional ecclesiastical position.

To instance one question more of the vital sort or active kind for the discussion of which THE REVIEW could serve. That is the question, always in order, how more effectively to do our part as a body standing for the revival and re-information of the Christian life at the Lord's hands in His Second Coming. There will be measures and methods, even men, perhaps, to discuss. But the conditions of our own work require us to be more searching than this in canvassing the question. Those conditions, of waning effectiveness, have persisted through the use of various measures and methods and despite the efforts of many, different men. Our question is not the frequent, discouraged one, why we do not grow. If that is part of our inquiry about effectiveness, it is not a major

matter at least. A small body can still do its work strongly and tellingly. But there has been a falling off in the effectiveness with which our work is done. In part this is due certainly to the passing of strong men, whose places have not been so well filled. But the declining effectiveness goes back to their day. There are deep causes for it. It ought to be profitable to find out what they are. That the day is not ripe for the work is sometimes suggested; but was it a bit riper once? And has not the Lord started the work, and summoned workers? Poor command of the cause of the Church may be an occasional explanation. But there seems something of wider operation at the back of such a steady falling off in effect as we have seen. Is it misconception of the world, which is the field, and misconception of our part, possibly? Nothing could be more crippling. Discussion that will push into adequate causes for a declining effectiveness will be worth while, just as it must needs be penetrating. The subject will be bound up for us with thought of the "old church" and the "new." Discussion will have to get well inside the force of these terms to get us anywhere. It is our bearings in Christendom that we are taking. We need to see with truth world and work. Ineffectiveness in a body which stands for the cause to which heavenly and Divine power devotes itself, seems to mean some mal-adjustment, to task, or to field. Unflinching and constructive discussion here, we are sure, our readers would like to see. A paragraph in *The Journal of Religion* (July, 1923, p. 423) records the fact that in 1922 the membership of Christian Churches in this land increased by nearly a million. Percentages in gains were larger in the smaller than in the larger bodies. There was an average gain of 2 per cent for all. "A conspicuous decline of 19 per cent is found in the Churches of the New Jerusalem." "It would be interesting to inquire into the specific reasons for gains and losses. Such a study would furnish much needed information for church leaders." We might well be interested in studying what others find worth the effort, so long as we mean to go unflinchingly to genuinely hindering causes and habits in our work.

These are active matters, vital conditions, urgent issues, which we have so far recounted, on which THE REVIEW would like to serve more than it has. But the discussion of academic subjects, too, could be carried where it has not reached yet. There are implicated in the Theological Works, for example, bodies of information and thought, left suggestive largely, which will take "working out." Implied in the Doctrines throughout is a psychology, in outline, which goes beyond what we have in "The Soul," but which has never been set out by a student of psychology, able to bring general competence to the work. Scattered in the Theological Works, and worked with often, is an interpretation of the spiritual history of the race. This is often treated as though it were church history. For its best presentation some one versed in comparative religions and in the new "science of religion" as well as in church history needs to devote himself to its study. There are the many fields of Bible study to be entered, a few untouched, others fields generally labored in, but not by us. Religious education is a subject we have given only little thought to, except as we have quite identified it with Bible and doctrinal study. Those interested to push ahead in the study of the Theological Works, it may be in esoteric study, or in interpretation of their thought and teaching to current interest and thought, will need for occasional expression of their findings and of their questions some such paper as THE REVIEW. Studies of the character we have just mentioned would be especially welcome in the Department of Studies.

THE REVIEW looks forward to the consideration of questions of how best we may do our work as well as of the more academic themes on which, perhaps, we have expressed ourselves more frequently. It hopes that contributors, familiar and new, will prosecute their studies in its pages in a fresh growth of study and intellectual interest in the Church. It will do what it can to be a stimulus to this growth as well as an outlet for its products.

WILLIAM F. WUNSCH.

CREEDS, DOCTRINES, RELIGION, AND LIFE

One of the disturbing features of present-day thought is the disposition to oppose creed to religion. No doubt there is a distinction to be observed here, grounded in the fact that a creed is characteristically a product of thought, whereas religion is a more comprehensive and concrete expression of life. But the prevailing forced contrast to the disparagement of creeds rests not so much on the real and proper distinction, as upon long-lived tradition and sectarian antagonism, out of which has developed an opposition to creeds as such. We have first of all the sectarian opposition of Protestants to Catholic creeds, decrees, and practises; but more fundamental is the natural-minded self-assertiveness which rebels at all restraint, especially that of accepted religious faith and doctrine. The contemptuous attitude of the scientists of the day towards creeds is largely anti-sectarian and partisan. Unenlightened naturalism, narrow-minded sectarianism, and a superficial habit of mind, are in the main responsible for this mistaken, exaggerated, and mischievous practise of contrasting creed with religion.

In the classical days of creed-making, the Christian Church was stirred with deep and powerful motives to formulate the Christian faith in definite and distinctive thought and statement, which were meant to be both true and binding. In the earlier days, during the period of the Fathers and the Scholastics, the concepts and terms of Greek philosophy offered the only means of systematic reflection and expression. With the ascendency of Rome, the scenes and terms of the Roman law courts, and the language of Roman law, were introduced and engrafted on the body of Greek terminology, much to the confusion of Christian thought and speech; for out of this grew the whole apparatus of the Atonement scheme.

First of all we have those impressive formulations, the Apostles' Creed, the Nicene Creed, the Athanasian Creed; and afterwards the decrees of Councils, and the elaborate doctrines and systems culminating in the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas. The Protestant Reformation gave a new impulse to creed-

making, and there resulted the great doctrinal statements known as the Augsburg Confession, the Thirty-Nine Articles, and the Westminster Confession. These and innumerable other creeds were formed, and had their earnest and militant partisans who believed them to be the truth, and enforced them as the truth.

But the diversity and conflict of creeds is not the most significant aspect of the situation. The creed-makers, with all their zeal and learning, encountered metaphysical and psychological difficulties and problems which they were not prepared to meet or solve; and they naturally resorted to abstractions and metaphors, which seemed to bridge over the gaps, and which had the appearance but not the reality of knowledge. It was this fact especially that was responsible for the diversity and conflict. Now, conflicting and contradictory creeds could not all be true; and even where they agreed, they were construed and interpreted differently because of different metaphysics and psychology. Under these conditions it was inevitable that the partisans of one creed would condemn and despise the creeds of others; and here we note one source of the opposition to creeds. Each party, forgetting its own creed-making, decried all creeds and creed-making as vain and mischievous. We have inherited the disposition and maintained the habit; and especially we share the Protestant antipathy to Catholic creeds. The Protestants, while ever busy making creeds and sects, are characteristically intolerant of creeds in general.

But the warfare of creeds has not been limited to religious sects. The so-called warfare between religion and science has centered for the most part in the opposition between the creeds of the scientists and the creeds of Christians. First the creed of Galileo opposed the creed of common sense and of the Catholic hierarchy; then the creed of the geologists opposed the creed of Genesis; now the creed of the evolutionist opposes that of the orthodox Christian. This warfare has aroused the opposition of the scientists to Church creeds in general; and forgetting their own creeds, they undertake to denounce

all creeds. This scientists' propaganda has infected even common sense and common religious sentiment, so that everywhere —in press, forum, and pulpit—we hear creed opposed to religion.

If the only creed-makers were the religious sectarians, and if the truly religious and the practical men, even the scientists, were without creeds, the case would be simple enough. But so long as the business man has his carefully worked-out policies and plans, based upon well defined and co-ordinated business principles which really constitute his business creed, and so long as the common man is rational, and has the capacity to think consistently, and frames his body of convictions, we must recognize creed-making as a proper and highly needful human function.

This sketch of history, and a little reflection, ought to suffice to make it clear that the real ground of opposition and antipathy to creeds is not just the nature of creeds or of creed-making, but the fact that there are creeds different from ours. We naturally and properly, inevitably, hold our own creeds to be true; and we must therefore in consistency regard other creeds different from ours as false. It is, then, not the nature of creeds as such, but their truth or falsity that is in question; and it is about this real issue that the warfare of creeds has raged. When the man on the street, on the forum, or in the pulpit assumes a superior air, and opposes creed to religion and life, he is merely giving uncritical expression to the inherited prejudices and traditions of long past ages; he is exhibiting what ignorant modernists style "the mediæval type of mind." He is, of course, a Protestant. Catholics are too well educated or too well led to indulge in such shallow and mischievous pastime.

No doubt creeds and creed-making, like other possessions and interests, have been abused. Creeds have been made instruments of oppression and domination; and creed-making has been made the vehicle of self-assertion, and of sectarian animosity and bigotry. These are, unhappily, human incidents in any exercise of freedom or function. On the other hand,

creeds have been indispensable means of religious, moral, political, and scientific progress. However, it is not so much the abuse of creeds, as the existence of creeds of a certain type, that has provoked wholesale disparagement and condemnation. In the early stages of the Church, creed-making was inspired and directed by the motive to put in concise statement the teaching of the Gospels. Creeds grew up as means of common understanding and fellowship in worship, and were used as forms for admitting members into the Church, and for testing fitness for membership. Later, more elaborate statements were formulated by councils and assemblies, and were imposed by authority upon the body of believers as a protection against schism, and as a guide to correct thinking and righteous living. Such imposition was naturally resented and resisted. The Protestant Reformation was a systematic and organized protest against the exercise of such authority, and against the validity of the creeds. In this way "creeds" came to mean in Protestant circles Catholic creeds, and later in scientific circles religious creeds in general.

New-Churchmen have obviously and properly no part in these sectarian attitudes and controversies. We have, of course, a creed, which is summed up and beautifully expressed in our Book of Worship; and it is our proper concern to know and understand this creed, to make it a guide of thought and of conduct, and to proclaim it to the world for the salvation of the world. We may sympathize with the creed-making of all ages, and see it as inevitable and indispensable for progress in morals and in religion; but at the same time we must appreciate the conditions under which the creed-making went on, and make allowance for error and perversity. In short, we recognize that creeds may be true or false, or true in some respects and false in others; but we have no prejudice against creeds as such, no opposition to creed-making, in spite of the abuses to which it may lead. We are rather interested in the *nature* of creed-making, and in the use of creeds.

When we consider with due attention the motive and the process of creed-making, we see that a creed is a product of the

first importance in psychology, ethics, and religion; that it goes back to the fundamental fact of the universe, and to our doctrine based upon it, namely Love. Love is from first to last a purposeful process, a process of making and realizing ends. The first movement of love is to be conscious of its qualities and their meaning. It selects what may be termed a quality-complex, and in identifying it, distinguishes it, sets it apart, and thus projects it as a quality whose meaning is to be sought, developed, and comprehended. In this process the quality-complex is constituted an end to be striven for, pursued, and realized. To use space metaphors,—this quality-complex, so objectified and constituted an end, stands in certain very definite and characteristic relations to the body of love of which it is a quality or affection; it is a self-projective, self-representative, self-realizing state and act of the love. These relations hold between the love which is the individual man and his every particular state, affection, thought, judgment, etc.; and it is these relations that give such particulars their character and significance. A creed is a complicated case of such particulars; it is a complicated and highly organized selection of the states of one's love, of the affections, impulses, desires, purposes, ideas, thoughts, and conclusions, in all of which one's love manifests itself. In other words, our creeds are the products of our emotions, thoughts, and judgments; and they are practical when they are formed, entertained, and used as guides to conduct. This is the ultimate end and function of all creeds, for creeds like all mental states are forms and functions of love.

What has been said is true both of what are termed private creeds and of creeds made by agreement and held in common. In fact, there is, strictly speaking, no such thing as a private creed; creeds are social products, whether held privately or in common. This is another way of saying that creeds are formed necessarily and invariably under social influences, and have social effects. It is, however, both true and important to recognize that creeds may be adopted by an individual or a group having no part in the making of them. In such a case, the creed is

more or less an external object, and calls for insight, understanding, and comprehension, before adoption. In any case, a creed is a psychological, an ethical, or (most important of all) a religious product. It involves the whole range and variety of mental states; it expresses and conveys a purpose; and in ordinary usage it has the nature of God and His relations to man for its subject. We do, of course, speak of practical creeds, scientific creeds, ethical creeds, as well as of religious creeds; but ordinarily, when creeds are denounced in the press, on the forum, or in the pulpit, religious creeds are meant. We shall now confine our attention specifically to religious creeds.

As a statement of belief held in common by a religious community, the use and importance of a religious creed may be taken for granted as obvious. It is not merely a fixed and definite form of statement in words of the common faith, but it serves as a standard of belief and a guide to conduct within the community of believers and worshipers. As such, it is indispensable to the union, co-operation, and religious communion of the body of worshipers. Creeds may, of course, be narrow and specific, or broad and vague; brief and summary, or elaborate and extensive. For example, Faith in Christ is the creed which in a vague sense unites all Christendom. But as soon as the qualifying phrase "as what?" is suggested, then immediately distinctions arise which characterize various Christian sects. Faith in Christ as an exemplary man and teacher; Faith in Christ as the Son of God and a Member of the Trinity from eternity; Faith in Christ as God in the Flesh and, as the Glorified Man, the One Only God: these and other creeds result from the attempt to interpret and define what is meant by "Faith in Christ." Other forms of the qualified creed are: Faith in Christ as Divine; Faith in Christ as the Son of God; Faith in Christ as the unique manifestation of God. These expressions may be said to be true as they stand; but when the attempt is made to say more precisely what they mean, the words "Divine," "Son," "Manifestation," are found to be so vague as to lack definiteness and distinctiveness; so that Uni-

tarians and Trinitarians alike may profess these creeds. To secure definiteness and to avoid confusion, creeds have been elaborated, and great doctrinal systems have been constructed. One of the most elaborate and comprehensive of these doctrinal systems is Swedenborg's "True Christian Religion," which was meant to be a complete statement and exposition of the essentials of Christian doctrine. Such a system may be accepted or rejected according to one's judgment of its truth or falsity; but if it is really true, it will remain true for all time. Men's understanding and judgment may change with the growth of knowledge and insight; but if a creed, dogma, doctrine, or system is true, it is eternally true. Truth is truth forevermore. For ordinary observation and for ordinary purposes, it is true, and it will remain true, that the sun rises and sets. Further knowledge and scientific accuracy may interpret and correct the appearance, and to readjust our language we may say it is an apparent truth; but the appearance remains as certain and as constant as ever. Looking at the solar system as a whole, we say that the sun stands still; and with reference to the revolving planets this is true; no added knowledge will change the truth of it. But the astronomer who has in view the immense system of the stars, thinks of the sun as moving through space with amazing speed. These are creeds at three different levels of observation and knowledge; they are each true within their own limits, and the truth of each is fixed and constant. The same may be said, presumably, of creeds in general; but the limits within which they are true are not so clearly defined as in the case before us. This gives plausibility and excuse for the common assertion that it is wrong to have fixed creeds because they need to be changed constantly with the growth of knowledge. If creeds are false, of course they need to be changed; but if they are true, we should hold fast to them, and not let them be changed to suit changing fancies and opinions, and seeming advances in knowledge. A religious creed is too serious a matter to be subject to the whims and tastes of uneducated and unregenerate individuals who are swept along by the shifting currents of the day, driven by

worldliness, and by an arrogant naturalism and rationalism. The fact that we are surrounded by creeds all of which seem to be true to some people, and which claim to be true, does indeed impose upon us the obligation to choose our creed; but we are faced with such choices at every turn in life. And so the case of religious creeds is not exceptional.

The choice of a creed, then, is not only obligatory, it is necessary, and indispensable to a well ordered moral and religious life. The contempt of creeds, and the wholesale rejection of creeds, is a mere blind delusion; it is again the case of a choice of a creed, the creed, namely, that all creeds are idle and mischievous. The plea and contention that practical religion dispenses with creeds is another delusion, a very obvious and vicious one. Even taking religion at its lowest level and at its minimum, as mere doing good, we still have a standard of good, a belief in what is good, a knowledge of what is good; otherwise doing good is simply acting out the natural impulses of the moment, which in most cases is what we would call doing wrong. To act from mere impulse is a very good definition of wrong doing. On the other hand, to act from a duly selected motive, and with a well directed purpose, with full knowledge of means to end, and with adequate grasp of consequences, is ordinarily the approved rational procedure of good conduct. Such rationally and purposefully organized experience employs a general scheme or plan wherein right and wrong, good and evil, are distinguished, and incorporated or eliminated. This is well ordered conduct, and results from an intelligent application of accepted principles. The body of principles so accepted and held to be true, when definitely formulated in thought and language, is an emotional and intellectual product, and is a formal and practical creed. The creed is religious when the motive and organizing principles are belief in God and in a body of convictions about His character and His supreme direction of the affairs of men and the world. In the nature of the case, therefore, creed and religion are what Swedenborg calls a distinct one, *Distincte Unum*. Creeds, as has been said, may be false; and even when true they may

be held as a mere form of words or a body of abstractions, not understood. As such they may or may not be held quite apart from the actual practical life; or they may be firmly held as true, though not understood, and at the same time exert a direct and controlling influence upon life, religious, moral, intellectual, and practical. In short, creeds are essential constituents of truly human and rational life, and (most important of all) of religious life. We may analyze experience, and distinguish and set apart creeds from the emotional, sentimental, intellectual, and practical life, just as we may isolate emotions, sentiments, ideas, and the several classes and groups of these; but in the actual concrete life they are conjoined and co-operative functions that do not exist separately. This is the real and intimate nature of experience, known and understood ever since Augustine, or even Plato. There is, then, no excuse in educated circles for opposing creed to religion, or doctrine to life. Creeds may be true or false, intelligible or unintelligible, held in the abstract or applied and embodied in the concrete; they may be used or abused; but they are in the nature of experience inevitable and indispensable.

Lewis F. Hite.

BIBLICAL AND DOCTRINAL STUDIES

IDLE WORDS

It has seemed to many that in certain sentences in the Gospel of Matthew undue weight is attached to the words we speak:

Out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh. . . . I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment. For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned. (Matt. xii, 34, 36, 37.)

Yet this passage does not stand alone in emphasizing the seriousness of our utterances. In the Proverbs of Solomon it is said that, "Death and life are in the power of the tongue"; that "a wholesome tongue is a tree of life"; and that "whoso keepeth his tongue keepeth his soul." (Prov. xviii, 21; xv, 4; xxi, 23.) And coming back to the Psalms of the Word, we find them constantly warning against the danger of our words:

Keep thy tongue from evil, and thy lips from speaking guile (Ps. xxxiv, 13).

Thou understandest my thought afar off. . . . For there is not a word in my tongue, but lo, O Lord, Thou knowest it altogether (*ibid.*, cxxxix, 2, 4).

I will take heed to my ways, that I sin not with my tongue; I will keep my mouth with a bridle, while the wicked is before me (*ibid.*, xxxix, 1).

Let the words of my mouth and the meditations of my heart be acceptable in thy sight, O Lord, my Strength and my Redeemer (*ibid.*, xix, 14).

In Malachi (ii, 17; iii, 13), it is said:

Ye have wearied the Lord with your words. . . . Your words have been stout against Me, saith the Lord. . . . Ye have said, It is vain to serve God; and what profit is it that we have kept His ordinance and that we have walked in black before the Lord of hosts?

And then there are those solemn words of our Lord in the Gospels:

> Whosoever shall say to his brother, Vain fellow, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Graceless wretch, shall be in danger of hell fire (Matt. v. 22).

And why all these warnings in the Scripture, unless our words are serious things? The fact is, that words are not abstractions, as they may seem to be; they are actual things, just as real as any other action or deed. They are one of the ultimate forms of feelings and thoughts. They are feeling and thought carried out to their farthest projection, gone to the length of their rope. "Out of the abundance of the heart, the mouth speaketh," says the Gospel; and the Psalm declares, "Thou understandest my thought afar off . . . for there is not a word in my tongue, but lo, O Lord, Thou knowest it altogether." The desires of the heart, and the thoughts of the mind! These are as actually expressed in words as they are in deeds. Their beauty is just as precious and captivating, or their deformity just as hideous and repelling. Their caress may be as gracious, or their blows as cruel. Words are things! They are ourselves, brought forth to view,—and just as truly ourselves in their way as actions are ourselves in their way.

And this is why our words must be accounted for. They leave their mark, their sum-total making our hymn of life; or, if we insist, our dirge,—all as definitely and permanently recorded upon our eternal being, as are the sound dents upon a phonographic disc. "And I say unto you, That every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment."

Any one may see, of course, that this does not mean the words arbitrarily; but rather *what they mean to us when we utter them.* And this is the law; for they are that measure of ourselves at that time. Being our feelings and thoughts, brought out to the surface and given their freedom, they are actually so many entries upon our "book of life"—folded in and laid away. After we have said them, they have passed forever beyond our reach, beyond recall. As a deed that is

done can never be undone, so a word once said can never be unsaid; no more its mark upon the page of life, erased. Does this seem hard?—discouraging? If so, just remember that it is equally beautiful,—equally full of hopes and promise; because the beautiful, the noble, the strong, the sweet, the pure, the uplifting, are just as indelible as are their opposites. And it is our privilege to cultivate and multiply these, and to choke out and stop the increase of the others. It is in our hands, which way we want to grow; and the Lord in His Word has taught us how to choose. Therefore, it is not hard; and it should not be discouraging. Knowing the importance of our words, let us speak accordingly.

In order that we may have a very definite idea of the difference between thoughts and feelings expressed and unexpressed, consider the parallel in Nature; viz., moisture as it falls in rain, or as it remains suspended in the atmosphere. When affections and thoughts take on definite forms in the mind, they clamor for verbal utterance, as thunder-heads in the sky press for permission to explode and cast their contents to the ground in electric fire and rain. If these clouds are permitted to reach those conditions which condense them to the point of precipitation, then they are past recall; they deposit themselves upon the earth beneath, to work for good or ill, according to their quality, as they are gentle or severe. But kept in the sky, kept from precipitation, they do no harm, and they do no good. So it is with the feelings and thoughts which we refuse to speak, or to precipitate in words. We hold them in a neutral state; and it is only when we will to speak them, that their mark is made permanent. Follow the natural parallel farther. It is only through precipitation that moisture in the atmosphere can have any appreciable effect upon the ground, either to make it spring forth and bud, or to carry it away with a flood. When the physical heavens utter the words that are cruel and destructive, by casting down their angry torrents, note how the hillsides are scarred and tortured into gullies. And see how each successive down-pour deepens and widens the cuts. This is exactly the way that evil and destructive

words mar the hillsides of our souls, the way they dent and wash away the finer substances of our character.

One of the strongest of our impulses is to speak out whatever emotions or thoughts may be aroused in us; to turn them loose to work their works and make their lasting marks for good or for evil. If these emotions and thoughts are kindly, constructive, calculated to serve a genuine use, then well and good; let us give them utterance, full and free and strong; for then they will be like the gentle rain that enriches the earth with larger growths and better harvests. But if they be otherwise, let us by all means seal our lips and choke them back from utterance. Let our prayer be: "Set a watch, O Lord, before my mouth; keep the door of my lips." There is power in holding back. The thunder-head, if kept suspended until peaceful conditions prevail in the atmosphere,—or, we may say, until the excessive heat has been tempered,—may finally give forth its rain in beneficent calm, and helpfulness. So may we gain by holding back those words which would give vent to thoughts and feelings which are unkind, unhelpful and unworthy.

Of course it would be possible for one to harbor evil and ungenerous feelings and thoughts while for reasons of expedience they were still withheld from utterance. But in such a case they would be the same as spoken, so far as the effect upon the person himself is concerned, because in his heart and mind he had spoken them, or given them expression and therefore fixity, as far as he had felt free to do. It is the will and effort to hold back these things that really counts for gain; for it is this that gives discouragement to the feelings and the thoughts themselves. They find no satisfaction in existence if they are denied expression, or at least the hope of expression at some future time.

This matter ought to have a practical interest for all of us; for as long as there is life there is room for improvement; and we need to avail ourselves of every help that the Lord provides. For example: There comes a day when, from our point of view, and as we say, "Things have gone wrong." The

feeling of fatigue shades off into discouragement, and the impulse surges over us to give voice to a feeling of complaint. Then is the supreme opportunity to discourage such feelings. Choke them back, refuse to yield to their utterance. Form the habit of doing this, and even the impulses, the feelings themselves will grow weaker and weaker, until they cease to be. Or again, some sudden reversal of our plans, or some direct rebuff may cause a flash of hot resentment. We grow suddenly so full of intensity that it seems as if there must surely be a cloud-burst; we feel that we must speak it out; our feelings simply have got to have the right of way; it must be known exactly how we feel. This is the time to take a second thought, and the time to compel ourselves to hold our tongue. Each time that we win such a victory we shall find ourselves a hundred-fold repaid for all its cost. For we soon shall learn that these emotions that we deny expression to die away and cease to trouble us; whereas we can remember that when we used to give them vent, they kept before us and grew and grew, and pained the more the fuller their expression.

Again, there is another gate where we need to stay on guard. And this is the one our neighbor passes by for our appraisement. His *actions* of course we have to judge,—whether they would be right or wrong for us. But his *motives!* Ah, here is the opportunity the devils offer us to smear our minds with mud; or on the other hand, one that the Lord offers us to gather to ourselves the flowers that lift their heads up out of the mud. For whatever we try to attribute to others will reflect the quality of the things we really like to look upon. But whatever may be the sinister suggestions that may come to mind regarding their possible or probable motives, let us make it a matter of conscience, a policy on principle, to refuse absolutely to allow them to pass between our lips. I wish I had the words to adequately set this forth. It is so important for us, when we want to say something about another that is unkind and ungenerous, when we would call his motives black, *not to say it.* If we have suspicions,—unless by divulging them to another that other's welfare may be actually safeguarded,—

let us by all means hold them back from utterance, for our own sake, and for that of all concerned. How often,—yes, how almost universally these suspicions are wholly or nearly groundless,—just a failure to know all the circumstances, plus our natural proneness to look for darkness rather than light. And what a double wrong we do when we set a train of these suspicions loose: the wrong we do that other; the wrong we do ourselves; and beyond all this, the wrong we do to all those others who shall take up the dirge that we have started on its wail of death. Can we squarely face these things, and then think lightly of the power of words? Can we doubt that, "Every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment"? And can we possibly allow ourselves to go on speaking lightly and ungenerously of others, and still elude the judgment power of these weighty words: "For by thy words thou shalt be justified, and by thy words thou shalt be condemned"?

Everett King Bray.

HOW THE WORD CAME

How the Word, as we have it in our Scriptures, came to be, is not a curious question. Some knowledge of the process may easily lead to a more enlightened use of the Book. It may result in an increased confidence in the Bible as the Word of God. The practical effect of the Scriptures on men, inspiring them to their regeneration, should not be alone, though it may be primary, in attesting that in the Scriptures we have the veritable Word of God. Why should not a view of the process by which the Scriptures formed, add a peculiar witness to that fact?

There are two sides to the process by which the Scriptures formed,—an under-side, to speak of it so, and an upper. A literature formed, and a truth was given. When we ask how of each, inquiry takes us into two different fields. Of a book of the Bible we want to know when it was written, where,

in what circumstances, by whom, for what purpose, and so on. We can search out the history of the literature which we have in the Scriptures. We may be led to trace the present form of a book back into earlier, separate documents or traditions. So, for example, *Kings* itself declares that it is to be traced. Hands busied with the extension or compilation of a book may be unknown to us; but any history of the book has to allow for them, unnamed, shadowy figures though they are. Such a story of how the books of Scripture took form, so far as we can recover it at all, is the under-side in the full process of the giving of the Word. It is a story to be discriminated from any theological view of the deeper origins of the Word. The two accounts, historical and theological, are in different fields. They should prove mutually helpful, and certainly there is no necessary antagonism between them. We look to literary criticism, historical study of several kinds, and other fields of Biblical research to put this historical account together, of how the Scriptures formed.

Then there is what we are terming the upper-side in the process of the formation of the Word as we have it in our Scriptures. Now we are asking, not how the books sprang up on earth, but how the truth in them made its way from the Divine mind to the mind of spokesman or writer. Of this upper-side of the process theology has sought to speak in its conceptions of inspiration, and its various theories of Bible formation. And this is the domain of theology in the matter. Theology is not concerned with the natural history of the books which constitute the Bible, though it certainly is not free to proceed without regard to the facts of that history. Its concern is with that more interior process which was the issuance of the Word from the Divine mind, and its lodging and expression in one or more human minds. The rest is fact, and even scientific fact, to be established by the pertinent historical and literary studies; just as we turn to science to trace the formation of the earth, though we may have a deep religious conviction and a full-bodied theological teaching on the earth's origin, along with all other things, in God.

Of this more interior process, the issuance of the truth of the Word from the Divine mind to find expression in spokesman and writer, and ultimately in the Scriptures as we have them,—of this more interior process the Theological Works of Swedenborg have amazingly varied and rich things to say. The object of the present study is only to bring some of these, perhaps all the chief of them, together, in the effort, especially, to establish their exact relationship to one another.

The Theological Works have two terms by which, in a word, they characterize the whole process of the giving of the Word, i. e., what we have called the upper-side of the process. They say of the Word as a whole that it came by "dictation." This is a much more comprehensive term than we may be inclined to take it for. Previous use of the term in this connection inclines us to think it means dictation of words; but why not of truth? Why not of justice in given circumstances? Or of duty? All the Word, according to the Theological Works, came by "dictation." When we look, either at them or at the Scriptures, closely, it seems apparent that we must give this term a very wide connotation. The preface to *Luke* (i, 1-4) does not admit the strict verbal dictation in the composition of the Gospels which we may find in some other Scriptures. Yet "dictation" is a term used to characterize the process of the giving of the Word generally. "True Christian Religion," n.6, offers a good example of the sweeping use of the term:

> All Sacred Scripture teaches that God is, for the reason that in its inmosts it is none other than God, i. e, the Divine which proceeds from God. For it has been dictated by God, and nothing else can proceed from Him than that which is Himself, and is called Divine. This the Sacred Scripture is in its inmosts.

The Theological Works use a second general term of the way in which the Word in the Scriptures came to be. A student of the idea of influx in those Works could have anticipated that they would describe the giving of the Word under this term, too. The Word came by "influx." Let an unusually interesting passage from the "Arcana" serve as

our example of this way of characterizing the process generally:

"Ye have seen that I have talked with you from heaven." That this signifies all things of the Word by influx from the Divine through heaven, is evident from the signification of speaking or talking from heaven, when by Jehovah unto those who are of the church, who are represented by the sons of Israel (n. 8930), as truth Divine, or the Word from the Divine through heaven; for that which Jehovah speaks is truth Divine, thus the Word which is in the church, and that which He speaks passes through heaven. It should be known that heaven is not in any certain and fixed place, thus not, according to the common opinion, on high, but heaven is where the Divine is, thus with every one and in every one who is in charity and faith; for charity and faith constitute heaven, because they are from the Divine, and therein also the angels dwell. That heaven is where the Divine is, that is, where the Lord is, is plain from this, that mount Sinai, from which the Lord spoke, is here called heaven, and this is also the reason why by mount Sinai is signified heaven, from which is Divine truth (n. 8805). That all things of the Word are signified is because Jehovah or the Lord then began to reveal the Word which should serve the human race for doctrine and life, first by Moses and afterward by the prophets. That therefore they might know that the Word was from the Divine through heaven, the Lord Himself willed to come down and with a living voice proclaim the ten commandments, and thus to show that what was to follow of the law, that is, of the Word, was in like manner by influx from the Divine through heaven. (N. 8931).

Influx, then, involves the whole spiritual world in the process of the giving of the Word. The truth God speaks crosses that world to our consciousness here. Both "dictation" (*cf.* Heaven and Hell, n. 259) and "influx" (*cf.* 8931 above) imply this transit of the spiritual world and its levels of understanding by truth. But the teaching goes on not only to imply such a transit of the heavens by the truth of the Word, but an active participation of the heavenly world in giving the Word. This is something more.

"Send, I pray, by the hand of him whom Thou will send." That this signifies that the Divine truth proceeding from the Divine Human shall be mediately uttered, is evident from the representation of Moses who says this, as the Lord as to the Word, that is, as to Divine truth (see n. 6752); from the signification of sending, when said of the

Lord, as proceeding (n. 2397, 4710); and from the signification of sending by the hand, meaning by another to whom power will be given, namely, the power of uttering Divine truth proceeding from the Divine Human of the Lord; and as it is by another to whom power is given, it is mediately. It was shown above (n. 6982, 6985), that the Divine truth immediately proceeding from the Lord's Divine Human, cannot be heard and perceived by any man, nor even by an angel. Therefore that it may be heard and perceived, there must be mediation, which is effected through heaven, and lastly through the angels and spirits with man. (*Arcana Cœlestia,* n. 6996.)

This mediation is not necessarily the work of the personal intermediary of whom we shall speak shortly, but general. The spiritual world is the great area-way over which thought in general reaches us out of the depths of the Divine mind.

Eventually all this limitless grant of truth must make its way to some particular spokesman. The Theological Works go on to define forms which the influx of truth takes at the reception of it by spokesman or writer. It may arrive at his consciousness in vision, dream, or verbal but inward communication, we read.

It is known from the Word that there was an influx from the world of spirits and from heaven into the prophets, partly by dreams, partly by visions, and partly by speech; and also with some into the speech itself and into the very gestures, thus into those things which are of the body; and that then they did not speak from themselves, nor act from themselves, but from the spirits which at the time occupied their body. (*Arcana Cœlestia,* n. 6212.)

Indeed, just before the influx terminates so in the spokesman of the Word, it may have terminated on the further side of him in taking overpowering possession of the mind of some spirit or angel. That is, the mediation of the other world becomes special or focussed in some one unseen personality, which in the perception and delivery of a truth is said to be "filled with the Divine aspect" (Apocalypse Explained, n. 1228). We do not need to consider the presence of such an intermediary as invariable. Influx could be determined, instead, to spiritually significant scenes in the other life or to "representatives." Certain freer ways which truth has taken

to make itself known, or by which Scripture was set down, would not call for such individual mediation.

Indeed, one of the values of collating afresh what the Theological Works have to say of the giving of the Word, is that statement puts bounds to statement. Seemingly flat and exclusive or comprehensive statements prove not really so. The Theological Works characterize the whole process of the giving of the Word as "influx" over and over again, for instance; yet they will also say, as at "Heaven and Hell," n. 254, that the Word was given not by influx, but by dictation. It is not that these are different. They are more or less co-incident. But dictation is influx and something more. Any and every thought we have is by "influx." But here was the influx of truth directed to the precise object of forming Scriptures. That directed influx is "dictation." The dictation is the authority with which the truth comes. It may consist in the guiding impulse under which material is assembled (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 1468e); or it may consist in the aptness with which the truth expresses itself, or the force with which it takes words to itself in the spokesman (ibid., n. 4652). The last named mode of "dictation" was found with the prophets (Heaven and Hell, n. 254). But, again, we have not felt that this mode of giving the Word extended to, say, the Evangelists (*cf.* The Bread of Life, by John Worcester, p. 83). Is there reason to make it the exclusive way, even, in which truth came to the prophets? One sees Jeremiah on the contrary improving the wording of an argument; or holding to a thesis, despite the fact that events disprove some of his conclusions from it; yet all is a part of the recorded Word. Or there are the facts of Israel's history, lying ready to any one's hand, recorded faithfully in annal and story; and the prophet who gives us *Kings* is overborne, strictly, by a certain view of that history; it is interpretation of events which comes "dictated." In *Hosea* the constancy of the prophet's own love for his erring wife has afforded the experience in which his conviction forms of the constancy of Jehovah's love for erring Israel. In both these instances, moreover, as in others which

could be cited, and throughout the Gospels, let it be noted that we also have something besides dream, vision and speech, for the form which influx or dictation took in the spokesman or writer. A too restrictive reading of the passages on any one point may keep us from following up at all fully the wide suggestiveness of the Theological Works on the manner of the giving of the Word.

It is to be noted, too, that much of what is said in the Theological Works on the giving of the Word is said of how the Word came *at the act of composition*. But the act of composition is a small part of the process by which the Word came to be in the Scriptures. There is the utterance of the Word by an Elijah who writes nothing; yet the process of revelation was there in his utterances. Jeremiah writes nothing for twenty years, but throughout he is preaching the Word of God, and what later is recorded. We have been speaking above, more of what is directly given—the truth, however apprehended. But indirectly so much else had been brought into existence before, which became the content, too, of the Scriptures. Existing religious ordinances, modes of sacrifice, events of a spiritually significant history, stretching back centuries before a book (as we have it) records it; the land itself, providing a spiritually meaningful setting to event (Arcana Cœlestia, n. 10559[3]); the stock of correspondential language which had grown over untold time, and was the revered treasure of the prophets; the revision of documents from time to time; this, and more has to be reckoned into any "giving of the Word." The giving of it includes all this accumulation and fashioning of materials for the Scriptures. Here Divine influence was active, too, and "dictation" goes back to all this provision of the contents of Scripture. Much then, as the Theological Works themselves show, in the process of the giving of the Scriptures lies the other side of the act of composition. But many statements have to do with only this act of composition.

Even at the act of composition, whether oral or written, the Divine influence worked by a variety of ways. It awak-

ened a man to the purpose of recording the Lord's life, and left composition to accurate recital of known facts (*Luke* i. 1-4). The free action of the Holy Spirit guided Christian memory, and composition became a record of sayings and incidents attested by those who saw and heard them (the *Gospels* generally). Divine influence creates a mental state in which a supernatural representation of truth is watched, later to be recalled and set down (*Revelation, Zechariah*). Or the Divine determination on self-expression stimulates the thought and conviction of a spokesman to such a pitch that the truth to be conveyed strikes into the very words to be used, and is grasped only as it sounds in the words. No one statement takes care of the process even at the single act of composition.

This study only seeks to bring together the main ideas in the Theological Works on the process by which the Word in the Scriptures came to be; and what is a somewhat new articulation of them into a general view. The ideas are large and suggestive; really no single hard and fast theory of how the Scriptures formed is set down. Terms are exceedingly general. The experiences dealt with, "dream," "vision," "internal speech," take study. And throughout we are in a realm far less tangible than we enter when we follow up the under-side, as we have called it, of Scripture formation. We are at a process, in the issuance of the Word from God and its arrival at the human mind, which is large, if it is anything. It appears in the Theological Works, if we add our natural history of the Scriptures, as a two-world movement of truth. It is no conveying of abstract ideas, or mere setting down, of course, of words. It is a long movement of the mind of God, traversing the world of the spirit steadily, and striking into the history and career of a people on earth, and persisting over centuries to find its climax in the life, words and person of the Word made flesh. Its procedure is a slow religious education of the race, in which moral discipline and the tragedies and triumphs of history are prime agencies.

William F. Wunsch.

CURRENT LITERATURE

RECENT PSYCHICAL RESEARCH LITERATURE

Prompted by the general interest in spiritistic phenomena, the French periodical *L'Opinion* not long ago commissioned one of its staff, Monsieur Paul Heuzé, to prepare for its readers a series of articles based upon interviews with certain persons whose names are among the very most conspicuous in the present day annals of psychical research,—M. Gabriel Delanne, Dr. Gustave Geley, M. Camille Flammarion, Prof. Charles Richet, Père Mainage, Prof. Branly, and Madame Curie. Interspersed among the chapters devoted to presenting the views of these celebrities are others, either featuring letters from still other notables in this field,—Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, Maurice Maeterlinck, Mme. Bisson, etc.,—or commenting on some of the hundreds of epistles that poured upon the reporter on the appearance of the successive installments of his series of articles, which, together with suitable introduction and conclusion, complete the sixteen chapters that constitute the little volume recently published by E. P. Dutton & Co. in English translation with the title "Do the Dead Live?" In his opening pages M. Heuzé states that the purpose of his efforts is, "to explain briefly in its essential features the present condition of metapsychical research." Because of this the book should be of interest to all who desire information concerning the opinions held by noted Frenchmen who have spent years in the scientific (?) investigation of the subjects concerned. We query the word "scientific" here advisedly, for the term as used in this connection has to be understood in a much broader sense

* *Do the Dead Live?* An Inquiry into the Present State of Psychical Research. By Paul Heuze. Tr. from the French. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1923. 172 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $2.00.

than usual, owing to the nature of the subject. Psychical and metapsychical phenomena are perhaps within the realms of space and time as we know them; but they are not reducible to formulæ of mere matter and energy, nor are they reproducible at will under like conditions, as science requires; moreover, whether to be classed as mechanical or psychological, they are invariably due either to mysterious forces that seem to be intelligent or to "unknown powers latent in human intelligence."

We well remember how we were impressed some years ago when the death of the late Frank Podmore was announced, under circumstances that implied suicide. For years he had been a very active member of the English Society for Psychical Research, and he had written a number of books in this field; but after an initial period of waning credulity, he had taken, either wilfully or from conviction, an emphatically negative attitude towards any theory implying manifestations of discarnate personalities formerly living on this earth; and he subsequently maintained this position to the end. He always evaded the spiritistic hypothesis, which, whether true or false in any particular instance, is certainly the most obvious and natural explanation in a vast number of cases. He accounted for everything of this sort by "telepathy," and denied the actuality of phenomena not inclusive under this category. Now, while it is conceivable that his hostile attitude to the assumption of immortality and the possibility of intercourse between the living and the dead may have been taken wilfully in the interests of scientific demonstration,—assent to be given only on compulsion, as it were,—it may finally have become a habit of mind, resulting in a kind of insanity, with periods of despondency, in one of which he may have sought to put an end to his life. The fact that during his last years his wife and he did not live together may also be significant in this connection.

Well, whatever the truth of the matter in his case, a similar negative attitude seems to be that of the majority of the conspicuous figures among the investigators of psychical research in France at the present time. They are engaged in accumulat-

ing facts; they are not theorizing much. They are experimenting as carefully as may be under strictly test conditions, and are carefully recording whatever happens. *They admit the reality of the phenomena;* but as to the spiritistic hypothesis —or (to put it more exactly) as to evidence of personal immortality—they say that that conclusion is not inevitable, and that therefore they do not know. In short in this respect they are agnostics.

That, in brief, seems to be a fair summing up of the opinions expressed by the notables in this book, concerning one of whom (M. Charles Richet) we shall presently speak at some length in connection with his own recently published work in this field. We should mention here, however, that there is one definite exception to the prevailing agnostic attitude on the part of the persons here reported,—that of M. Delanne, who believes that some psychic happenings require the spiritistic interpretation.

In one other instance only—and that a somewhat amusing one—do we get an affirmation in the interests of spiritualism. The interview with M. Camille Flammarion as reported, exemplified the usual reluctance to affirm a spiritistic theory. "I have been investigating for sixty years," he says. "Today I can only assure you of one thing—that I know nothing, that *I understand absolutely nothing about it.* . . . After sixty years of research, *I know nothing—nothing—nothing.*" And this negative attitude is emphasized in the introductory and concluding remarks of the chapter, in which the interviewer repeats words uttered by Mme. Flammarion before her husband appeared, to the effect that "My husband is *by no means a Spiritist*"; and again after the interview: *"I tell you that my husband is not a Spiritist. And I repeat it. He is not a Spiritist at all."* But no sooner had this matter been given to the public than M. Flammarion was so bothered by the hue and cry raised by Spiritists who had thought him one of themselves, that he sent to the *Revue Spirite, Psychica, etc.,* a letter affirming that a recent volume by him "proves the existence of the soul independent of the corporeal organism." M. Heuzé comments

sarcastically on this assertion by M. Flammarion of two opposite opinions. But perhaps the inconsistency is merely that between M. Flammarion as a scientist on the one hand and as a normal human being on the other.

An especially interesting chapter in the book is that devoted to the views of Père Mainage, a Catholic priest who has long been investigating psychic phenomena. While he frankly affirms that the Church condemns spiritism and spiritistic research explicitly and absolutely, he states that it is far from disapproving *scientific* research in the field of psychic experiences. While Christianity and Spiritualism are mutually exclusive, this does not eliminate metapsychics as a subject for scientific study. He sums up his position (which is practically that of all the persons reported in this series of papers) as follows:

> The assertion of this science—and here I am in agreement with it—is this: It has no need of the dead; the spirit of the living suffices. Before invoking any preternatural or supernatural cause, all natural causes should be exhausted. . . . It seems to me that many things can be explained by telepathy . . . by hypnotism, i.e., suggestion . . . by the subliminal . . . and, lastly, by . . . the doubling of the personality. . . . (P. 116.)

Finally, let us say of this little book, that it is breezy and interesting, as any series of papers for popular consumption should be. Any reader to whom the subject appeals will enjoy perusing it.

Turning now to the volume by Prof. Charles Richet, entitled "Thirty Years of Psychical Research," * we have to characterize it as the most monumental work in this field since the publication of Prof. Frederic W. H. Myers' "Human Personality, and Its Survival of Bodily Death" some twenty-odd years ago. But whereas the earlier work gave evidence that the personal equation of its author as a man essentially re-

---

* *Thirty Years of Psychical Research,*—being a Treatise on Metapsychics. By Charles Richet, Ph.D. Trans. fr. the French by Stanley De Broth. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1923. 660 pp., 8vo., illustrated. Cloth, $6.00.

ligious entered into the treatment of the subject in such a way as to constitute the contents of the volume "sufficient reason" for an affirmative conclusion as to personal survival, all phases of the subject as handled by our noted Frenchman manifest his own agnosticism, if not positive disbelief, in this connection, and will confirm the same attitude of mind in readers of like disposition. But as the book presents most essentially a vast storehouse of "facts," every reader is at liberty to draw his own conclusions on the basis of the evidence presented, and need not form his judgment "by proxy" through the author.

In the volume Prof. Richet has attempted a new classification of the phenomena of psychical research; and the successive chapters of the treatise are in demonstration of that classification, as follows:

BOOK I. Concerning Metapsychics in General.

BOOK II. Subjective Metapsychics: (1) On Subjective Metapsychics in General; (2) On Cryptesthesia (Lucidity) in General; (3) Experimental Cryptesthesia; (4) The Divining Rod; (5) Metapsychism in Animals; (6) Sporadic Cryptesthesia; (7) Premonitions.

BOOK III. Objective Metapsychics: (1) On Objective Metapsychics in General; (2) On Cryptesthesia (Lucidity) in General; (3) Ectoplasms (Materializations); (4) Levitations; (5) Bilocations; (6) Hauntings.

BOOK IV. Conclusion.

There are many subdivisions, too numerous to reproduce here.

With regard to subjective metapsychics the author tells us that nearly everything of this nature "can be reduced to a single phenomenon" formerly called "lucidity" or "clairvoyance," but for which he adopts the name "cryptesthesia," meaning "hidden sensibility." It is his contention that "human intelligence includes a special and mysterious faculty which reveals certain facts, past, present, or future, that the senses are unable to supply." He maintains that the evidence for the truth of this statement is so overwhelming that it cannot be doubted as describing a fact; and in view of cryptesthesia as a fact, all phenomena of subjective metapsychics can be dealt

with without resorting to any theories such as either telepathy or intercourse with the spirits of the departed.

Perhaps the most significant section in the whole book as showing M. Richet's attitude of mind, is that on the Identification of Spiritual Personalities (pp. 208-220), in which, after giving an account of Sir Oliver Lodge's "Raymond," he remarks:

> Alas, no! survival is not to be proved thus; and despite the genius of its author, and his noble faith in the future life, this able book has not supplied the decisive data. If it were incumbent on me to formulate a conclusion, the very fragmentary, symbolical, and uncertain nature of these messages that claim to be from surviving minds, and their astonishing lack of precise detail, would lead me to infer that there is no survival of consciousness. This inference is made with deep regret, for it costs me much to separate myself from Myers and Lodge who have my entire confidence and admiration.
>
> Moreover, in the very midst of my negation, I feel it incumbent to make full reservations; we are only at the dawn of metapsychic science and all absolute negation should be ruled out.
>
> In fine, there are three possible hypotheses: (a) Everything comes from the mind of the medium; (b) the mind of a deceased person intervenes; (c) a non-human intelligence is concerned, an angel, a demon, or some other power.
>
> On subjective data alone the first hypothesis is certainly the most likely, since the admission that the human mind has mysterious powers of cognition covers the ground; the second seems hardly admissible because it is in complete disaccord with all physiology and implies innumerable psychological improbabilities; and the third is absolutely useless *from the point of view of subjective metapsychics taken alone,* and there is no real reason for putting it forward. (P. 216.)

This passage shows the position maintained by the author throughout his book, though at times he does refer to the spiritistic hypothesis as apparently reasonable. His knowledge of physiology (of which he is professor) and psychology, however, have apparently led him to the conclusion that the human mind does not survive the dissolution of the physical brain. But in the concluding chapter of the book (pp. 594-626), which summarizes the whole and is by far the most generally interesting within its covers, he incidentally advances a theory quite as remarkable and not nearly as reasonable as that of personal survival,—as follows:

Mysterious beings, angels or demons, existences devoid of form, or spirits, which now and then seek to intervene in our lives, who can by means entirely unknown mould matter at will, who direct some of our thoughts and participate in some of our destinies, and who, to make themselves known (which they could not otherwise do) assume the bodily and psychological aspect of vanished human personalities—all this is a simple manner of expressing and understanding the greater part of the metapsychic phenomena. (P. 622.)

It is worthy of remark that this is the only paragraph in the book given in full italics; and it perhaps expresses the author's actual belief. But whatever the final explanation or explanations of metapsychic phenomena may be from a scientific standpoint, the author maintains that his book furnishes a demonstration of the actuality of all the phenomena usually viewed as matters for psychical research. Cryptesthesia (a mysterious faculty of cognition independent of the physical senses) is a fact, with a multitude of phases; the ability of certain persons to discover underground water by means of the divining rod is a fact; actual monitions and premonitions in infinite variety are occurring sporadically all the time; in the presence of certain persons all the objective phenomena of mediumship—such as movement of objects without visible contact, materialized forms, etc.—actually take place without trickery of any kind; haunted houses and ghosts are not in all cases matters of pure imagination. If one is interested in seeing a large amount of evidence for these conclusions, there is no better book for him to procure.

The next book we have to consider—"Subjective Concepts of Humans," * by John J. Donnelly—attempts to explain all these things by a new theory original with its author. Mr. Donnelly was born and educated a Catholic; after ten years of preparation he entered the priesthood; and he continued in that capacity for forty-four years, at the close of which, having become a total disbeliever in Divine revelation and the teachings of his youth, he renounced the priesthood, and devoted

---

* *Subjective Concepts of Humans;* Source of Spiritistic Manifestations. By John J. Donnelly. New York: The International Press. 1922. 555 pp., 8vo Cloth, $3.00.

himself to the preparation and publication of this book. For the thirty-nine years subsequent to his first clairaudient experience in June, 1882, he spent such time as he could investigating this and allied subjects, trying in vain to account for them in a way satisfactory to himself until he hit upon the solution here propounded, which he believes is true and destined eventually to transform the world. We are all familiar with Swedenborg's teaching that in the spiritual world the surroundings of the personalities there correspond to, and are as it were but objectifications of, their internal states, varying as these vary, and disappearing when the personalities depart. This will perhaps aid in giving a partial idea of what our author has to say about subjective concepts as the cause of spiritistic happenings. He expresses his theory repeatedly in various ways through the course of the book; but it is perhaps best expressed in an italicized paragraph in the prefatory remarks addressed "to his friends," which presumably were among the last written before publication,—as follows:

When two human beings meet and exchange mutual recognition, each begets in spirit form a perfect living duplicate of the other, both as to his physical body and mental faculties. These concepts belong to the personality, the intelligence, and exist outside the body of the percipient, as did their prototypes. (P. x.)

These "concepts begotten of human intelligence by human intelligence," he tells us, "constitute the spirit world best known to man"; and "there are as many distinct spirit worlds as there are sentient beings on earth." Moreover, as (according to our author) the human mind is not immortal, but dies when the brain ceases to function and disintegrates, so the spirit world thus dependent upon such living personality also ceases simultaneously to exist, together with all the objectified subjective concepts peopling it. It should be explained in this connection that the objectification is not actual in the sense of being perceivable by another living person, but merely to the person having the concept. "The inhabitants of the spirit world . . . . are not objective existences, but subjective existences begotten by the human personality, owned by it, and heard by

it alone" (p. 241). The book is devoted to explaining all sorts of spiritistic phenomena from the standpoint of this theory,—at least all sorts that the author considers genuine. But personally we are quite sure that there are a multiplicity of supposedly genuine instances presented by such a book as that of Richet just considered that would completely baffle any such attempted explanation. Incidentally Mr. Donnelly asserts that all religions of importance have been founded by clairaudients, who have set forth the pronouncements of their own subjective concepts as revelations from the Divine Being Himself; and in this way he deals briefly with Swedenborg and "Swedenborgianism," thus manifesting his own quite inadequate knowledge of the autobiographic elements in Swedenborg's writings as now available for the study of any student of this important field.

But how numb and atrophied our higher natures tend to become in the atmosphere of negations found in such books as these. There is nothing here for our intuitions of the true, the good, and the beautiful to feed upon; and it should not be forgotten that such intuitions evidence a real part of our nature of more importance spiritually than the dissecting and analytical intellect. Turn our backs on God, and we stultify our natures as a whole.

How immeasurably different the phenomena of the spiritual world may become when viewed with God at its center, is shown by the remarkable experiences of Swedenborg. As a psychical researcher—if we may use that term of one who made no prying investigations—he was absolutely unique. Like the psychologist who studies his own mental experiences, and formulates his thoughts thereon accordingly, so in the realm of psychical research Swedenborg was both observer and observed,—at least, what he observed was as it were within himself. He had no occasion to resort to mediums or others with familiar spirits in order to study the phenomena of the spiritual world; but the Lord Himself, having chosen him to be the instrument by which to impart to mankind new and accurate knowledge of such matters, took him in hand as it

were, opened all the senses of his spiritual body, and led him here and there and everywhere in that world, giving him all sorts of experiences as a passive pupil under His guidance and protection, so that "from things heard and seen" and otherwise experienced there, he might write about that world, and make known also in elementary measure *what the angels in heaven know to be true and good and therefore beautiful.* As to psychical research matters, he tells us in one way or another of many of the things mentioned by Richet under the heading of Subjective Metapsychics; and he explains the experiences involved in a way that does no violation to our religious sense. In fact he presents the most beautiful religion the world has ever known in historic times; and incidentally we learn all we need to know about psychical phenomena and their explanation.

B. A. WHITTEMORE.

THE CONTEMPLATIVE LIFE

The term "mysticism" belongs to that group of words which are much used, but seldom defined. As a result, one can never feel quite sure in advance with what connotation it will be used in a given instance. The writer of "Western Mysticism,"* Abbot Butler, a Benedictine monk of England, in his prologue makes it clear, however, that such confusion is comparatively modern. The proper term historically is "contemplation"; and this term held its ground well into the late Middle Ages. Hence the sub-title of the book under review uses the older word of the Latin Church, "contemplation." This is used consistently throughout the work in the sense of "direct contact of the soul with Transcendental Reality" (Fr. Sharpe).

As typical of the experience one may cite a single sentence

---

* *Western Mysticism:* the Teachings of SS. Augustine, Gregory, and Bernard on Contemplation and the Contemplative Life,—neglected chapters in the History of Religion. By DOM CUTHBERT BUTLER, Benedictine Monk of Downside Abbey. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1923. 357 pp., 8vo. Cloth, $5.00.

from St. Augustine: "My mind in the flash of a trembling glance came to Absolute Being—that which is." The immediate communion with the *Prima Causa,* the Absolute, God—as men variously term that Force which, moving, is Itself unmoved—this is mysticism. Just here it may be well to say that Fr. Butler warns us against the common thought that mysticism exists either in opposition to practical living or (a still more common notion, perhaps) in opposition to the ministrations of the Church and the sacramental system. The greatest saints, we are both told and shown, made no such "vicious contrast."

"Western Mysticism" limits itself to the study of three great saints and doctors—Augustine, Gregory, and Bernard. Not one of these was a recluse. Augustine is the greatest figure in the Latin Church; Gregory was a Pope, perhaps the greatest of the Popes; of Bernard of Clairvaux we are told:

> [He] travelled all over Western Europe on missions for popes and potentates; he preached a Crusade; he controlled bishops, popes, and councils; he was mixed up in all the controversies of the day, whether of theology or ecclesiastical politics; he was the dominant ecclesiastical and religious force of the time.

Nor was there, of course, anything of the anti-ecclesiast about these three great figures. Symmetrical souls, they found help and inspiration and the grace of God in the active life, and in the services and sacraments of the Church, and in inner communion with the Sacred Heart of Jesus. The different types of religious experience were to them not contradictory but complementary.

I have said that "Western Mysticism" limits itself. And here is the great value of the book. In place of the sketchy and fragmentary quotation of the mystics which one finds in most of the many books on the subject, we have gathered here in convenient shape the meatiest passages on the contemplative life from the writings of three great saints. And these writings are arranged and classified so that the three may be compared on any subject here dealt with. This gives the reader a decidedly important *corpus* of material from which he can

draw his own conclusions as to the meaning and value of the Interior Life. Added usefulness is given to the collection from the fact that the three Doctors represent quite completely the varying types of mystical experience: St. Augustine, intellectual mysticism (he never, in the opinion of Fr. Butler, left his Neo-Platonism); St. Bernard, emotional or affectional mysticism (the passionate marital love of *Jesu, dulcis memoria,* and the eighty-six sermons on The Song of Songs); and St. Gregory, intermediate between the two, less eloquent, more practical in counsel.

After a first section, much the larger, in which the experiences of the mystics are arranged under the general head of Contemplation, there follows a second, perhaps particularly interesting, on the Contemplative and Active Lives, in which the two are related. Beginning with St. Augustine, we find that most of the discussion of this subject is in the form of a commentary on the two wives of Jacob, Leah and Rachel, in the Old Testament, and on Mary and Martha in the New. Both of these parts passed into the conventional religious symbology of the Middle Ages, and are found in the "Divine Comedy" of Dante. Mary has chosen the *better part* of contemplation.

> Martha chose a good part, but Mary the better. What Martha chose passes away. She ministered to the hungry, the thirsty, the homeless: but all these pass away,—there will be when none will hunger nor thirst. Therefore will her care be taken from her. "Mary hath chosen the better part (*meliorem*), which shall not be taken away from her." She hath chosen to contemplate, to live by the Word. (P. 201.)

Rachel is, again, the contemplative life and Leah the active. Says St. Gregory:

> Rachel was beautiful but sterile, because the contemplative life is lovely in the mind, but while it longs to rest in silence, it does not generate sons by preaching; it sees but brings not forth, because while it loves the pursuit of its quiet, it is less inflamed in gathering in others. . . . Leah, on the other hand, was dim-eyed but fruitful; because the active life, while it is occupied in work, sees less; but while, now by word, now by example, it incites others to imitate itself, it generates many children in its good work. (Pp. 215, 216.)

Besides the two distinct types of experience, a third, or

mixed type, is represented. This, the life which includes both the active and the contemplative elements, St. Gregory terms the highest; and this "mixed life" is, as Fr. Butler, following his authorities, insists, *"open to all."* The busiest of us must "take time to be holy," must retire into the closet of the mind to pray secretly for the riches, the unsearchable riches, of God. Every heart must have its Shrine of Quiet: *Vacate et videte quia Ego sum Deus.* We cannot all have the powerful experiences of the great saints of whose interior life it has been a pleasure to read, but we can all have—nay, must have—a religious experience. "Beyond the Sacred Page I seek Thee, Lord." Through, yet beyond, Church and Creed and Bible we seek Jesus, the One *Divinely Sweet,* the One *Altogether Lovely.* We join the company of saints and doctors and the army of the humble in this world, who blessedly bear Jesus in their hearts; and we press on, hoping, with St. Paul, to apprehend that by which we are apprehended; for in Him we live and move and have our being.

Books of mystical experiences are interesting to us as biography or psychology; they satisfy a certain intellectual curiosity in us. But humanity cannot rest in intellectualism. We learn in order that we may live. A book of this sort may be more than a piece of curious and interesting reading. It may tell us of Jesus; it may lead us to want to know Him, and knowing Him, to love Him above all created love, and to find in Him eternal life and felicity.

O felix hominum genus,
Si vestros animos amor
Quo cælum regitur regat.—(*Boethius*)

EDWARD AUSTIN WARREN, JR.

"IMMORTALITY CERTAIN."*

The little volume, by Mr. T. Mower Martin, bearing the title "Immortality Certain," is not, nor does it purport to be,

**Immortaliy Certain.* COMPILED BY T. MOWER MARTIN. Toronto: Macmillan Co. 1922. 190 pp., 16 mo. Paper, 75 cents.

an original investigation into its subject, but rather a compilation from various sources of material which Mr. Martin believes will testify to the certainty of future existence.

The book's main contention, "that the human race, in the vast majority of cases, has always, and does still, believe in immortality as man's prerogative," is proved by the archæological and other material presented in its three general divisions —"The Testimony of Mankind," "The Testimony of Man's Construction," and "The Testimony of Revelation." But the certainty of immortality, however, is not so proved; for immortality is not certain simply because the human race has, so far as we know, always believed in some form of it.

The title of the book is somewhat unhappy, in that it engenders anticipations not fulfilled by the nature of the contents. The certainty with which the book impresses one is more of assertion than of fact. But this, perhaps, is the fault not so much of the author as of the subject. For immortality, like the existence of God, cannot be satisfactorily proved by human reasoning, even when it be supported by the testimony of Divine revelation. The best that anyone can do is to adduce material tending, not to prove the certainty of immortality, but to strengthen certainty of belief in the hope of the immortality which the Word sets before us as a fact of human life. This Mr. Martin's book does, or may do.

The book seems to be intended for the general public, but actually it is addressed to the New-Church reader. We do not believe it will enjoy wide or even moderate popularity in either field. Earnestly enough done, still it is not particularly appealing. It is not the kind of book one would care to hand around as representative of New-Church authorship. Many observations irrelevant to the subject, such as the little disparaging thrusts which Mr. Martin makes at certain members of what he styles the "school of agnostic thought" and at certain religious organizations, might well have been omitted.

H. Durand Downward.

THE LIFE OF CHAUNCEY GILES

By CARRIE GILES CARTER

A vital chapter in the history of the New Church. 500 pp., 8 vo., $4

SKETCHES OF THE NEW CHURCH IN AMERICA

By EDNAH C. SILVER

Price $1 net, postage extra (send 24c, and excess will be returned)

PRAYERS

By JOHN WORCESTER

A discourse on prayer, involving an explanation of the Lord's Prayer, followed by thirty-two short prayers suitable for daily use

Price, art paper cover, 25c postpaid; Ooze leather, 50c postpaid

(Size 3¼ x 5¼ inches; will go in an ordinary envelope)

Order the above publications from the

Massachusetts New-Church Union

134 Bowdoin St., Boston 9, Mass.

THEOLOGICAL WORKS OF EMANUEL SWEDENBORG

STANDARD EDITION, $1.00 per volume, postpaid

LIBRARY EDITION, $1.50 per volume, postpaid

Also LATIN and LATIN-ENGLISH EDITIONS.

Send for catalogue containing complete lists.

FOR MISSIONARY PURPOSES

we supply the UNIFORM EDITION books (paper) at 5 cents per copy, postpaid.

THE AMERICAN SWEDENBORG PRINTING AND PUBLISHING SOCIETY

16 East 41st Street **New York, N. Y.**

TWO REMARKABLE BOOKS
By HENRY JAMES
NOW AGAIN AVAILABLE.

Henry James, the elder, was the father of the famous novelist of the same name, and of the still more famous psychologist, Professor William James, who doubtless would not have attained the eminence they did but for their remarkable progenitor. Though never a member of the New-Church organization (which he unfortunately scoffed at and vilified, ignoring its inevitableness), he was nevertheless a most energetic advocate of Swedenborg's teachings as he understood them. The two books here advertised were first published by the Houghton, Mifflin Co. in 1869 and 1879, but have been unavailable for some time. Recently we were able to buy up the remaining unbound sheets, and now offer them in bound form for the benefit of other readers. The former prices were $2.50 and $3 00 respectively. The new price is $2.00 each, postpaid.

SOCIETY THE REDEEMED FORM OF MAN AND THE EARNEST OF GOD'S OMNIPOTENCE IN HUMAN NATURE.

"This handsome volume contains the latest reflections upon the doctrines of Swedenborg in their practical application to man and to society of, perhaps, the most original thinker among the readers of Swedenborg's works. Original, we mean, in this: that there is nothing of the commonplace in what Mr. James gives to the world . . With this decided originality, too, in thought, we always expect to find quite as decided an originality in style, humorous or out-of-the-way illustrations, whimsical references to men and incidents, vigorous periods, and striking epithets: all these abound . . . . These peculiarities of thought and style may be found in this book in abundance exceeding anything to be found in 'Substance and Shadow,' and 'The Secret of Swedenborg,' remarkable as those books are in all the particulars we have mentioned. **Yet notwithstanding all that can and must be said in disparagement of Mr. James' work, no one can carefully read them without great gain.**"

(Introductory words of C. H. Drew in his review of this book in vol. 3 of the New Series of the **New Jerusalem Magazine,** pp. 39-44.)

THE SECRET OF SWEDENBORG
Being an Elucidation of His Doctrine of the Divine Natural Humanity.

"The following seem to have been the objects which Mr. James proposed to himself in writing this book,—that Swedenborg as a philosopher is not an idealist, and will be found, to a student of philosophy, immeasurably superior to the prince of idealists, Hegel; that the doctrine of the Divine Humanity, as Mr. James understands it, is not so clearly presented by Swedenborg, but that it needs a simpler, better, and different presentation to make it understood by the world; and that this doctrine is the explanation of certain exceedingly perplexing questions of philosophy, and the way out of many philosophical difficulties; to show something of the operations of Mr. James' mind in its process of apprehension of this doctrine; and, lastly and specially, to vilify and express his contempt for those receivers of the doctrines taught by Swedenborg who have formed church societies."

(From the review of this book by C. H. Drew in vol. 42 of the *New Jerusalem Magazine,* pp. 472-479.)

Prices Reduced to $2.00 Each, Postpaid.

Orders, accompanied by checks made payable to Albert P. Carter, Treasurer, should be sent to the

MASSACHUSETTS NEW-CHURCH UNION

134 Bowdoin Street, - - - - Boston 9, Mass.